

Minutes of the MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE November 26, 2012

APPROVED

| PRESENT: | Melinda Carrillo, Haydn Davis, Katy French, Barb Kelber, Greg Larson, Teresa Laughlin, Jackie Martin, Pam McDonough, Christina Moore, Linda Morrow, Lillian Payn, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka, Fari Towfiq |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ABSENT: | Ken Dodson, Patrick O'Brien |
| GUESTS: | Liam Ferris, Terry Gray, Michael Lockett, Wendy Nelson, Fred Rose, Katie Townsend-Merino, Judy Wilson |
| CALL TO ORDER: | The meeting was called to order by the President, Greg Larson, at 2:02 p.m., in Room SU-30. |
| Approval of Minutes: | |
| Motion 1 | MSC Towfiq, Moore: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of November 19, 2012, as presented. The motion carried. |
| Public Comments: | There were no public comments. |
| Announcements: | Greg Larson reminded all that the newly formed Leadership Development Committee of the Statewide Academic Senate is hosting for interested faculty a series of free, one-day regional workshops on the topic of college leadership. The workshop in our area will be held on Friday, November 30, 2012, from 10:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m., at Grossmont College. |
| | Greg Larson announced that because of lengthy agenda items, Reports haven't been heard in several weeks. He will make an attempt to wrap-up all of the Information items by 3:00 each week in order to set aside the last half-hour of the meeting to complete this section of the agenda. |
| Agenda Changes: | Senate members agreed to suspend the agenda to hear Action item C, Academic Technology Committee: Blackboard Course Management System Modules, as there were guests present. |
| Academic Technology Committee: Blackboard Course Management | |
| System Modules: | Liam Ferris, a representative of Blackboard, provided a presentation to Senators on the Blackboard Community Module. On the overhead, he showed some examples of the features of the program, including updates that will be available in 2013. At last week's meeting, Lillian Payn provided information outlining the advantages of licensing additional modules to our Blackboard Course Management System that would add significant academic and administrative functions to our existing licensing agreement. |

Faculty Senate Meeting, November 26, 2012 Page 2

| | According to Payne, as she first noted last week, this upgrade would address Accreditation Recommendation #5, that the district offer the same services to online students and face-to-face students. |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Members of the Academic Technology Committee are asking for the Senate's support of the district purchasing the upgrade at a cost of approximately \$90,000. Terry Gray noted that this was being brought to the Senate because items needing long-term or annual funding cannot be included in PRP funding, so there is not currently an apparatus to get such an upgrade funded. |
| | A question and answer period followed on the capabilities of the program, as well as the costs and the way in which it may be funded. There was concern voiced about the process of bringing a funding request to the Faculty Senate in this way, as the Faculty Senate is not usually asked to endorse purchases. Senators also wanted to be clear on what exactly was the role of the Faculty Senate regarding this expense, whether it was being asked to simply endorse the Academic Technology Committee's recommendation since, as it was noted, the Faculty Senate was not in a position to prioritize this expenditure over other possible college expenditures. |
| Motion 2 | MSC Payn, Martin-Klement: The Faculty Senate endorses the Academic Technology Committee's recommendation to license additional modules to Palomar's Blackboard Course Management System. The motion carried. |
| Committee Appointments: | |
| Motion 3 | MSC Towfiq, Laughlin: Faculty Senate approval of the following committee appointment: |
| | Learning Outcomes Council (12-14) Part-time Academic Michael Deal/Life Sciences |
| | The motion carried. |
| Motion 4 | MSC Kelber, Morrow: Faculty Senate acceptance of the results of the ballot for the following committee appointment: |
| | Distinguished Faculty Award Committee Chris Johnson (11-13) |
| | The motion carried. |
| Curriculum: | Curriculum items dated November 7, 2012, were available for review to Senate members last week. |
| Motion 5 | MS Morrow, Moore: Faculty Senate ratification of the Curriculum items dated November 7, 2012. The motion was amended. |
| | Pam McDonough asked that items 8B and 8D be removed for separate discussion and consideration. |

Faculty Senate Meeting, November 26, 2012 Page 3

| Motion 5 amended | MSC Morrow, Moore: Faculty Senate ratification of the Curriculum items dated November 7, 2012, with the exception of items VIII B and VIII D: Psychology Credit Course Change Requisites and Advisories for PSYC 100: ENG 50 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | The motion carried. |
| | Pam McDonough stated her concerns about any department establishing a prerequisite that presumably affects another department without the other department having a voice in that decision, noting that she supports departments making decisions they believe to be in the best interests of students, but that all departments involved need to have that power to make decisions about what is best for their program and students. She noted that starting this semester a Curriculum Committee subcommittee has been discussing the implications of more departments adding communication and computational prerequisites, examining the desirability of the college adopting a process called "content review" as an avenue for adding prerequisites, and addressing the need for institutional planning before adoption of prerequisites that have effects outside the department bringing forth the prerequisite. Haydn Davis stated that the Psychology Department had followed established procedure in adding an English 50 prerequisite and that the Curriculum Committee had overwhelmingly approved this prerequisite. He also stated that the Psychology Department had eventually tried to communicate with the English Department and voiced his belief that the Psychology Department was rebuffed in its efforts. Discussion followed, and Senate members talked about not only this particular instance, but also the need for collegiality as the college grapples with a myriad of issues. |
| Motion 6 | MSC Morrow, Davis: Faculty Senate ratification of Curriculum items VIII B and VIII D dated November 7, 2012: Psychology Credit Course Change Requisites and Advisories for PSYC 100: ENG 50 |
| | The motion carried. |
| Confidentiality Agreement: | Greg Larson reported that Vice President Tortarolo has postponed any further revisions to the Confidentiality Agreement until next semester due to concerns from Faculty Senators. This item will be removed from the agenda. |
| GE Assessment/ Disclosure of Participant Names: | Senate members heard a presentation from Wendy Nelson on Parts 1 and 11 of the GE Assessment Report, on September 24, and November 5. At the November 5 meeting, some concern was voiced that the Learning Outcomes Council (LOC) was recommending that in future assessments, faculty members who participate in the GE/ILO assessments will continue to be anonymous, without even the chair of a department knowing who from the department is involved in the assessment. Nelson indicated that the initial decision to keep the names private was due to a concern that faculty members may not participate if unsure of the level of support they would receive from their departments. It was also noted that the data was aggregated at a college-wide level rather than a department level, and random samplings are received based on students rather than course sections. However, some Senators have expressed that on some level department representation did seem important as the report listed the disciplines represented in the assessment of each outcome. There |

Faculty Senate Meeting, November 26, 2012 Page 4

| | was also concern that keeping the names confidential could work against the coherence of departments. |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Student Success | At today's meeting, Nelson again asked for Faculty Senate input on whether the names of faculty participating in the assessments should remain confidential, be made available on a broad scale, or just be presented to department chairs. Discussion followed at length on the current process, and what the possible benefits as well as potential disadvantages are, or would be, of providing the names of those who are participating. It was noted that the names of faculty who participate in other various committees, task forces, and other groups on campus are published, and, theoretically, since all faculty will be involved in this kind of assessment eventually, it would make sense to make this process more open and accessible now so it can be discussed among faculty who have participated and those who will eventually participate. In conclusion, Senate members agreed that it would be beneficial, with no clear drawbacks, to make available the names of all who participate. |
| Task Force Recommendations: | SB 1456 requires students to maintain academic progress standards in order to receive the BOG Fee Waiver. At last week's meeting, ASG Vice President Angel Jimenez asked how SB 1456 would affect continuing students who already get the waiver compared to how it would affect new students. Greg Larson reported that Mary San Agustin, Director of Financial Aid, said that students must be given reasonable notification of the new academic progress standards. It looks as if a one-semester notice will be considered reasonable. After that notification, all students will have to meet these standards in order to get the waiver. The bottom line is that the effect on continuing and new students will be about the same. Greg Larson indicated that more information will be forthcoming from the Chancellor's Office soon. |
| Policies & Procedures: | Barb Kelber reported that she, Perry Snyder, and Greg Larson have been attending the Policy & Procedures meetings. Updating Senators on documents discussed in the Senate a few weeks ago, Kelber stated that the Recruitment & Hiring Policy, which has been under review for approximately three years, continues to be discussed. Kelber added that she, Snyder, and Larson would like to prepare another document as a proposal that will better reflect the interests of faculty based on previous suggestions made by the Faculty Senate. Kelber indicated that she, Snyder, and Larson would be meeting with John Tortarolo on Monday, December 3, at 10:00 a.m. to discuss the Recruitment and Hiring Policy. |
| | Kelber added that the Prohibition of Harassment Policy and the related policy on Investigation and Training have been forwarded to the Palomar Faculty Federation (PFF) for negotiation. Kelber reminded Senate members of what the Faculty Senate had earlier suggested: that the document be concise, including only Education Code language. She recommended that these policies and procedures not be negotiated until the Senate has had the opportunity to review the most recent revisions of the document. Teresa Laughlin |
| | indicated that members of the PFF will review the document, and she will bring that information back to the Senate next week. |
| Other: | indicated that members of the PFF will review the document, and she will bring that |
| Other: ADJOURNMENT: | indicated that members of the PFF will review the document, and she will bring that information back to the Senate next week.Greg Larson informed Senators that a short Faculty Senate meeting may need to be held on |
| | indicated that members of the PFF will review the document, and she will bring that information back to the Senate next week.Greg Larson informed Senators that a short Faculty Senate meeting may need to be held on December 10 to ratify Curriculum items. More information will be forthcoming. |