



Pierce College Academic Senate

November 3, 2014 2:15-3:45 pm

Great Hall

Minutes

Members Present:

- Kathy Oborn
- Izzy Goodman
- Lyn Clark
- Constance Moffatt
- Joe Perret
- Monique Cleveland

- Wendy Bass
- Blanca Adajian
- Jody LaChance
- Erin Moran
- Monika Del Bosque

- Amy Sirrott
- Beth Abels
- David Schamus
- Kathy Holland
- Michelle Meyer

- Dick Ahrens
- Jill Binsley
- Crystal Kiekel
- Sara Harvey
- Lila Snow
-

- Christine Ersig-Marcus
- Robert Grogan
- Joanna Zimring-Towne
- Moriah Van Norman

- Frank Chartrand
- Diane Kelly
- Lauren Valdes
- Jamie Beavers
- Jacob Veiga

- Jeff Favre
- Margarita Pillado
- Lionel Greenberg
- Connie Tiu
- Anna Bruzzese

- Travis Orloff
- Mark Levick
- Angela Belden
- Beth Benne
- Denise Gibson

- Michael Cooperman
- Cara Gillis
- Constance Kocs
- Bob Martinez

Guests:

Mitra Navab (Math)

Dennis New (Math)

Nicollette Ash (Journalism)

Robin Sawyer (Counseling)

Clay Gedimon (Library)

Phyllis Schneider (Child Dev.)

Daisy Lam (Math)

Ryan Eagle (Physics)

Cristina (Journalism)

Stefani Z (Roundup)

Seth Perlstein (Roundup)

<i>Item Number</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Item Type</i>
1.	Call to Order	Senate President Kathy Oborn called the meeting to order at 2:16 pm.
2.	Approval of the Agenda/aka orders of the day	Joe Perret made a motion to approve the Agenda; Blanca Adajian seconded. Ania Bruzzese asked why item 8 b “NMP F-14-5” was under “new business.” Discussion ensued. Margarita Pillado made a motion to adopt the agenda with 8a under “old business”; Izzy Goodman seconded; motion passed with one abstention (Robert Grogan).
3.	Announcements	Anthropology and Geography Senator Erin Moran announced that a \$50,000 gift had been given to the Geography Department from retired faculty member Bill Russell, who recently passed away. A plaque will be dedicated in his name.
4.	Public Commentary – 2 minutes maximum per public speaker on matters related to this meeting’s agenda from the public	None.
5.	Approval of the Minutes from the previous meeting 10/20/14	Senate Secretary Monique Cleveland stated that she had received last minute additions to the meeting minutes of 10-20-14 (11:15 a.m. and 1:15 p.m.) and therefore the minutes had not been made available to the Senate for review. She also stated that the minutes from the 10-6-14 Senate meeting needed to be approved. Kathy Holland made a motion to approve the minutes of 10-6-14; Joe Perret seconded; the motion passed unanimously.
6.	College Administrative Report	Pierce College President Kathleen Burke discussed budget issues. A Custodial Supervisor has been hired and custodians are being interviewed. Candidates for the positions of registrar and registrar technician for Admissions and Records are being interviewed. Closed captioning: VPs and Deans will meet with departments to ensure that all media used in classes are being captioned. Anything taped off air can be shown once without captions but then needs to be captioned and copyrighted. Questions and discussion ensued. The president also discussed the improved campus evacuation process. Comments and discussion ensued.
7.	ASO Report – Alex Oloo	ASO President Alex Oloo gave an update on ASO activities, including the Halloween party. ASO has a new faculty advisor. Also, ASO holds their finance meetings every Thursday at noon. Students or departments who have financial requests should attend those meetings. A “Global Village” flyer was distributed [APPENDIX A].
8.	Old Business	
a.	NMPF14-5 How senate committees are populated – Beth Abels [APPENDIX B]	Treasurer Joe Perret made a motion to accept NMP F-14-5; Senator At-Large David Schamus seconded the motion. The motion was read by Senate President Kathy Oborn. Discussion ensued. Modern Languages Senator Margarita Pillado made a motion to strike out “ratified by the Academic Senate President.” The motion was seconded. Discussion ensued both for and against the amendment. Senator at Large Schamus called for the question. The motion was defeated. A vote was taken for the main motion. The motion passed with 19 YES votes, 6 NO votes, and 6 ABSTENTIONS.
9.	New Business	
a.	NMPF14-4 Request for an outside consultant to review our IT practices and policies [APPENDIX C] – Joe Perret	Treasurer Joe Perret moved to approve NMP F-14-4; Senator At-Large Blanca Adajian seconded; discussion ensued. Blanca Adajian called the question. Because this motion was noticed as “information,” the Senate Chair asked Senate members to take the NMP back to their constituents. David Schamus asked for a sense of the Senate regarding NMP F-14-4. The Senate members present were unanimously in favor of NMP F-14-4.
b.	FPPC prioritized new faculty hiring list – Constance Kocs	Constance Kocs presented the “prioritized new faculty hiring list” from the FPPC meeting of 10/24/14 [APPENDIX D]. Questions and discussion ensued. Senate members were asked to take the prioritized new faculty hiring list to their constituents so that Senate can vote on it at the next Senate meeting.
c.	Approval of Ethics Committee member – Emily Anderson	Margarita Pillado moved to approve Emily Anderson as a new member of the Ethics Committee; Kathy Holland seconded; motion passed unanimously.
d.	Approval of SFP (Specially Funded Program) Child Development Center Hiring Committee	Senator Holland moved to approve the Child Development Center Hiring Committee; Senator Benne seconded; questions and discussion ensued regarding the sunshine rule, as some items are presented under this rule and other are not.

	David Follosco, Dean Phyllis Schneider, CDC Chair Norma Fink, Faculty Lila Snow, Faculty, Senate Rep Mary Anne Gavarra-Oh, EEO Officer	Senator Pillado requested that the Senate Executive Committee issue clear guidelines on this matter. Past President Goodman called the question (MSP); motion passed unanimously.
10.	Discussion Items:	
a.	How are senate agendas prepared?	Izzy Goodman moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes; Joe Perret seconded; the motion passed. Senator Bruzzese requested clarification as to how the Senate agenda is prepared when the Executive Committee does not meet, as the Bylaws state such duty for the Executive Committee. In response, Senate President Kathy Oborn distributed an email from David Morse that offers an opinion on how agendas may be prepared. [APPENDIX E] Discussion ensued. Lyn Clark asked Kathy Oborn how she could get item 10. d sunshined for a vote at the next Senate meeting. Kathy Oborn stated that Lyn could make a motion. Discussion ensued in light of the discussion related to item 8.a.. Mark Levick moved to extend the meeting for five minutes; Joe Perret seconded; the motion passed.
b.	Pre and Co Requisite Policy	Second Vice President Moffatt requested feedback from the Senate regarding the Pre- and Co-Requisite Policy draft that was distributed with the agenda packet. [APPENDIX F] There were no questions or comments from the floor.
c.	Current governance structure of our Academic Senate	Information
d.	APC report to senate – campus technology issues and issues with handling grants	Lyn Clark reported that the APC would like the Senate to consider two NMP’s at the next meeting regarding campus technology and grants issues.
11.	Academic Senate President’s Report – Kathy Oborn	Information – not discussed due to time constraints
12.	Academic Senate 1st VP’s Report – Lyn Clark	Information – not discussed due to time constraints
13.	Academic Senate 2nd VP’s Report – Connie Moffatt	Please refer to item 10.b. above.
14.	Academic Senate Treasurer’s Report – Joe Perret	Information – not discussed due to time constraints
15.	Accreditation Chair – Margarita Pillado	Information – not discussed due to time constraints
16.	Academic Senate Committee Reports	
a.	DEITC – Mike Cooperman	No report.
b.	Student Success Committee – Crystal Kiekel	No report.
c.	Outcomes Committee – Monique Cleveland	No report.
d.	Professional Development – Kathy Holland	No report.
e.	Professional Ethics – Cara Gillis	No report.
f.	Faculty Position Priority Committee - Constance Kocs	No report.
17.	Campus Reports	
a.	Articulation Officer – Elizabeth Atondo	No report.
b.	Transfer Center Director – Sunday Salter	No report.
c.	Distance Education Coordinator – Wendy Bass	No report.

18.	Public Open Forum <i>Permits anyone to bring to the floor matters not currently on the agenda, though action may not be taken on any item. 2 minutes maximum per speaker.</i>	No report.
19.	Adjournment	Kathy Holland moved to adjourn; Joe Perret seconded; motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00

Academic Senate Meetings for Fall 2014 in the Great Hall
~~9/8, 9/22, 10/6, 10/20 (CSB)~~, 11/3, 11/17, 12/1

ASO presents
GLOBAL VILLAGE
lets share our culture and heritage

11-18-14

THE MALL & GREAT HALL

10AM-5PM

SUPPORTED BY GE PATH

asop@piercecollege.edu



**Pierce Academic Senate
Notice Motion Proposal
F14-5**

BACKGROUND

10 years ago, an accommodation was afforded to a Pierce professor which allowed for the creation of “double sections” and a local MOU was agreed upon between the union and administration.

Whereas:

For the past 10 years Pierce College faculty have had the opportunity to teach double sections – defined as 60 or more students enrolled in one class section that is pre-approved prior to the start of the semester in which the faculty member is paid as if it were two sections and faculty could only teach one double class per semester.

Whereas:

Pierce College has several large classrooms able to accommodate 60+ students: Physics 0913, Beh Sci 1308, Bus 3200, Art 3300, etc.

Whereas:

Offering double class sections enables the campus to maximize its facilities, classroom space, usage requirements, etc.

Whereas:

Faculty that teach online are offered the opportunity to receive a “large distance learning class stipend” for enrollment of 50-80 students, as per Article 40 – Distance Learning.

Therefore be it resolved:

That the Academic Senate of Pierce College requests that our faculty union restore the opportunity for faculty to teach double sections, as was previously agreed upon.

Ratified by the Pierce Academic Senate this _____ day of _____, 2014.

Pierce Academic Senate
Notice Motion Proposal
F14-4

BACKGROUND

Inadequacy of Campus IT Systems to Support Student Success

WHEREAS, Network connectivity via hardwire and wireless are essential to the Pierce College mission of educating our students.
WHEREAS, wireless network connectivity requirements by students, staff, and faculty continue to increase with the use of BYOD devices such as smart phones, tablets, and computers.

WHEREAS, wireless network connectivity at Pierce College is nonexistent, sporadic or unreliable.

WHEREAS, wireless network connectivity issues have continued to be an unresolved problem for several years.

Be it resolved that:

The Academic Senate of Pierce College asks the college administration to employ the services of an outside consultant to:

- Assess:
 - The overall network connectivity issues and the underlying infrastructure
 - The wireless coverage available and requirements
 - Organizational structure, management, and staffing of the Information Technology Department
- Recommend:
 - To rectify immediately the inability to connect to the hardwired and wireless networks
 - Infrastructure projects needed to provide reliable wired and wireless network services to meet the college's projected needs for the next 5 years
 - Wireless connectivity projects to meet the college's needs for the next 5 years
 - Organization changes needed to implement the recommended projects

Be it further resolved that:

- The recommendations of the consultant be implemented by incorporation into the colleges planning process for AY 14 through AY16
- This project be given the highest priority and attention and considered "mission critical"

Ratified by the Pierce Academic Senate this _____ day of _____, 2014.

APPENDIX D to Academic Senate Meeting Minutes of 11-3-14

RANK	Position	TOTAL	Avg	Comment
1	History	52.00	4.00	Auto - Loss of tenure track employee
2	CSIT.csit	50.50	4.00	Auto - Loss of tenure track employee
3	MEDIAARTS.cinema	50.00	4.00	Auto - Loss of tenure track employee
4	COUNSELING.NewStudent	50.00	3.85	
5	COUNSELING.general	47.00	3.62	
6	MODERNLANG.asl1	46.00	3.54	
6	PHYSPLANSI.physics	46.00	3.54	
8	MEDIAARTS.journalism	45.50	3.50	
8	THEATR&DANCE.theatre	45.50	3.50	
8	AGRICULTURE.animalsci	45.00	3.46	
11	INDUSTRIALTECH.auto	44.50	3.42	
11	MATH.math1	44.50	3.42	
13	PHILSOC.sociology	43.50	3.35	
14	CHILDDEVCTR.cdcenter1	42.50	3.27	
14	ENGLISH.english	42.50	3.27	
14	MUSIC.piano	42.50	3.27	
17	CAOT.businessed	41.50	3.19	
18	AGRICULTURE.horticulture	40.50	3.12	
19	BUSINESSADMIN.business	39.50	3.04	
20	ART&ARCH.studioart	39.00	3.00	
21	MODERNLANG.spanish	37.00	2.85	
22	THEATR&DANCE.dance	36.00	2.77	
23	MODERNLANG.asl2	34.50	2.65	
24	PHYSPLANSI.astronomy	33.00	2.54	
25	CHILDDEVCTR.cdcenter2	32.50	2.50	
25	MATH.math2	32.50	2.50	
25	LIBRARY	32.50	2.50	
28	BUSINESSADMIN.acctg	31.50	2.42	
29	ART&ARCH.architecture	31.00	2.38	
30	PHILSOC.philosophy	29.50	2.27	
31	MATH.math3	27.00	2.08	

APPENDIX E to Academic Senate Meeting Minutes of 11-3-14

APPENDIX F to Academic Senate Meeting Minutes of 11-3-14

Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation

The faculty in the discipline or, if the college has no faculty member in the discipline, the faculty in the department are responsible for approving courses and establishing their associated prerequisites and corequisites as a separate action. The approval of a prerequisite or corequisite must be based on the determination that it is an appropriate and rational measure of a student's readiness to enter a degree-applicable credit course or program .

Determinations about prerequisites and corequisites shall be made only on a course-by-course basis or requirements (per Title 5 §55003(a) and (j), respectively). Any course so established shall also have a clearly articulated challenge process that can be completed in a timely manner.

The college shall identify prerequisites, corequisites, advisories and the challenge process in the college catalog, each semester's schedule of courses, and the course outline of any course for which they are established (per Title 5 §55003(h)).

A. Guidelines for Establishing Prerequisites and Corequisites

In order to establish a prerequisite or corequisite it must be determined to be necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which it is being established. Necessary and appropriate means reasonably needed to achieve the purpose that it purports to serve; absolute necessity is not required. Prerequisites and corequisites may be established only for the following purposes (per Title 5 §55003(d)):

1. The prerequisite or corequisite is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation; or
2. The prerequisite will assure that a student has the skills, concepts, and/or information that is presupposed in terms of the course or program for which it is being established, such that a student who has not met the prerequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course within the program) for which the prerequisite is being established; or
3. The corequisite course will assure that a student acquires the necessary skills, concepts, and/or information, such that a student who has not enrolled in the corequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course or program for which the corequisite is being established; or
4. The prerequisite or corequisite is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health and safety of others.

B. The Process, including Levels Of Scrutiny, for Establishing Prerequisites and Corequisites

The levels of scrutiny required for establishing prerequisites, corequisites and advisories are content review or content review with statistical validation. Content review is a rigorous, systematic process conducted by discipline faculty that identifies the necessary and appropriate body of knowledge or skills students need to possess prior to enrolling in a course, or which students need to acquire through simultaneous enrollment in a corequisite course. At a minimum, content review shall include the following:

- a. Thorough review of the course outline of record (COR) for the target course
- b. Thorough review of syllabi, sample exams, assignments, instructional materials, and grading criteria for the target course
- c. Using the CORs of both the target and proposed prerequisite or corequisite course, identification of required skills/knowledge students must have prior to enrolling in the target course and matching those skills/knowledge to the proposed prerequisite or corequisite course
- d. Documentation that verifies the above steps were taken.

1. Statistical validation is a compilation of data according to sound research practices that shows a student is highly unlikely to succeed in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite or corequisite (per Title 5 §55003(f)). When this level of scrutiny is used, the college shall follow the guidelines specified in Title 5 §55003(g).

C. Exemptions from Scrutiny

A prerequisite or corequisite shall be exempt from scrutiny if it satisfies any of the following criteria (per Title 5 §55003(e)):

1. It is required by statute or regulation; or
2. It is part of a closely related lecture-laboratory course pairing within a discipline; or
3. It is required by four-year institutions; or
4. Baccalaureate institutions will not grant credit for a course unless it has the particular communication or computation skill prerequisite.
5. An external regulatory body requires recency (e.g. BRN)

D. Curriculum Review Process

The college curriculum committee is responsible for the curriculum review process. The curriculum committee reviews and approves the establishment of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories only upon the recommendation of the academic senate except that the academic senate may delegate this task to the curriculum committee without forfeiting its rights or responsibilities under Title 5 §§53200-53204.

When content review is used to establish prerequisites or corequisites in reading, written expression, or mathematics for degree-applicable courses not in a sequence, the curriculum committee will do all of the following:

- Provide training to committee members on the establishment of prerequisites and corequisites
- Inform faculty about the regulations regarding the establishment of prerequisites or corequisites using content review
- Direct faculty to the Office of Institutional Research to do the following: a) identify courses that may increase the likelihood of student success with the establishment of a prerequisite or corequisite; b) prioritize which courses should be considered for the establishment of new prerequisites or corequisites; c) monitor any disproportionate impact that may occur based on the establishment of a prerequisite or corequisite
- Use research to evaluate the effect of new prerequisites and corequisites on student success with particular attention given to disproportionate impact within two years of the establishment of the prerequisite or corequisite.
- Assure through communication with Academic Affairs that prerequisite and corequisite courses, and courses that do not require prerequisites or corequisites, whether basic skills or degree-applicable courses, are reasonably available.

1. Standards for Approval of Prerequisites and Corequisites. The curriculum committee will review the course outline of record to determine if a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student has knowledge or skills not taught in the course. The curriculum committee will also review the course outline to determine if success in the course is dependent upon communication or computation skills, in which case the course shall require as prerequisites or corequisites eligibility for enrollment in associate degree credit courses in English and/or mathematics, respectively (per Title 5 §55002(a)(2)(D) and (E)). If a course requires precollegiate skills in reading, written expression, or mathematics, the college will do the following (per Title 5 §55003(l)):

- a. Ensure these courses and sections are offered with reasonable frequency
- b. Monitor progress on student equity in accordance with Title 5 §54220 as follows:
 - The college will conduct an evaluation to determine if the prerequisite or corequisite has a disproportionate impact on student success.
 - Where there is disproportionate impact on any group of students, the college will, in consultation with the Chancellor, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the disproportionate impact.

2. Periodic Review of Prerequisites and Corequisites. Using an appropriate level of scrutiny, the college will review all established CTE course and program prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories every two years to ensure they remain necessary and appropriate; all other established course and program prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories will be reviewed every six years (per Title 5 §55003(b)(4)).

E. Challenging Prerequisites and Corequisites

Whenever a corequisite course is established, sufficient sections shall be offered to reasonably accommodate all students who are required to take the corequisite. A corequisite shall be waived when space in the corequisite course is not available (per Title 5 §55003(m)). A student may challenge any prerequisite or corequisite by submitting a challenge form to the Admissions and Records Office. The student will be enrolled in the requested class if space is available. The designated college committee will review the challenge, and the student will be notified of the committee's decision within the college's specified timeframe. If the challenge is denied, the student will be dropped from the class and refunded all applicable fees (per Title 5 §55003(o)).

Grounds for challenge are as follows (per Title 5 §55003(p)):

1. The prerequisite or corequisite has not been established in accordance with the district's process for establishing prerequisites and corequisites
2. The prerequisite or corequisite is in violation of Title 5 §55003
3. The prerequisite or corequisite is either unlawfully discriminatory or is being applied in an unlawfully discriminatory manner
4. The student has the knowledge or ability to succeed in the course or program despite not meeting the prerequisite or corequisite
5. The student passed with a C or better (C is equivalent to a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale) the prerequisite or corequisite at another US regionally accredited institution.
6. The student will be subject to undue delay in attaining the goal of his or her educational plan because the prerequisite or corequisite course has not been made reasonably available.