Minutes
Sacramento City College
Academic Senate
Tuesday, February 2, 2010

President                  Connie Zuercher
Vice President             Greg Rose
Secretary                  Angela-Dee Alforque


1. Call to Order: 12:04 p.m.
2. Introduction of Guests: Phil Cypret, Advanced Transportation Technology Faculty; Donald Button, Career Technical Education Faculty; Catherine Fites, Enrollment & Student Services Dean; Annette Barfield, LRCTF SCC President.
3. Approval of Minutes: The Senate moved, seconded and approved by consensus the minutes from the regular Senate meeting on December 1 & and the special meeting on December 8.
4. Reports: No reports.
5. Announcements
   a) Senate President Connie Zuercher reminded Senators to report Senate issues and voting items back to various departments and divisions so that colleagues have an opportunity to provide informed feedback.
   b) Senator Lisa Gunderson reported that there an out-of-town religious group called “GodHatesFags.com” plan to picket local places of worship (synagogues), high schools and a local theatre this weekend. Some of our students may be involved with counter-protests or otherwise affected by the activities of this high-profile group.

OLD BUSINESS

1. New Visual Identity--Reports from Senators. One person so far has given Connie some feedback on the new SCC logos that have been proposed by the SCC Graphic Design Department. A vote by the Senators on each of the three student-designed logos resulted as follows:
   Design #1: 3
   Design #2: 3
   Design #3: 3

No preference and or no change: a majority of the Senators reported a general consensus that none of the options were desirable. A question was raised about whether the new logo would replace the seal, and what the cost of changing letterhead, etc. might be Many Senators who responded felt that there was no need for the change and that the existing
logo was fine. Don Button, Faculty from Graphic Design, mentioned that our sister colleges have modern, more unified logos while SCC had a hodgepodge of 60-80 year old logos. The idea behind the proposal to change SCC’s logo was to make it more current and unified.

2. Senate Resolution - Troy Myers and other Senators who attended the meeting during Flex worked to further refine the Senate resolution which is now in draft version 4.0. After a brief discussion on the latest version, Connie asked for a motion to approve. It was moved, seconded and approved by the Senate to pass this version of the Senate Resolution. Connie thanked Troy for his work on the document and she will present the Resolution at the next District Board meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Senate Elections – Senate Secretary Angela-Dee Alforque announced the upcoming elections for Academic Senate positions. Since she is currently the only officer not running for re-election she will Chair the 2010 Election Committee, on which the following Senators volunteered to serve: Lorilie Roundtree, Nich Miller, and Sue Carriere. They will assist in proofreading the election packet materials which will be distributed to All Faculty, and also in validating the nomination forms and balloting. A request was also presented for the removal of instant run-off voting via paper ballots in favor of electronic ballots without instant run-off. A question was asked whether an electronic ballot precludes still having an IRV. Electronic ballot was approved, but the IRV issue will be revisited at another meeting.

2. Wait List Catherine Fites, Dean of Enrollment & Student Services addressed questions regarding the SCC Wait List policies. A question was asked whether wait listed students may be prioritized according to their status as continuing students already majoring in the program. Catherine responded that priority registration policies are set by the District Board, where priority 0 means that students in certain programs are able to register for classes the week before the general student population. Priority 1 students are chosen randomly and may indeed be able to register for classes even if they are not student currently in a given program. Prerequisites are supposed to restrict some of the enrollment but it does not always work. Another alternative to enrollment management is to reduce the wait list, which may be done by a Dean after consulting with all of the faculty members who teach the same particular course. A Senator noted that a problem may be that not all students show up and that restricting the wait list will leave out possible students who do have a chance of getting in. Another Senator argued that wait list considerations does vary by class or discipline, with some classes more impacted than others. Another Senator suggested that a smaller wait list would allow a faculty member some flexibility in how additional students may be added (e.g. random lotteries, students continuing in a program). Priority registration policies can not currently be changed to favor students who were in a class that had been cancelled.

3. CCSSE Information - Dena Chubbic, Counseling Faculty, and Marybeth Buechner, Planning, Research & Institutional Effectiveness Dean, distributed a handout describing the second administration and timeline of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Survey. It takes about 45 minutes to and hour to complete the survey and faculty are
being asked to allow the CCSSE to be administered in their classes if/when requested. Faculty may refuse, but it is hoped that they will participate in order to continue gathering useful data about our students. Dena will forward an electronic version of the informational handout to Angela to be distributed to the Senators via e-mail.

4. CTE Resolution - Donald Button, Career Technical Education/Graphic Communication Faculty and Phil Cypret, Advanced Transportation Technology Faculty gave a presentation regarding a resolution for a change in the minimum qualifications (MQs) for Career Technical Education (CTE) positions that will be heard at the statewide plenary session this spring.

Phil Cypret presented a case for the resolution to add an AA degree to the MQs for CTE positions. Education would be considered along with experience in the field, knowledge in the technical area, and teaching experience. It was noted that in the past, there was a legislative proposal to remove tenure protections for CTE faculty.

Donald Button presented a case against the resolution noting that it places unnecessary limitations into the hiring process. The reality is that in some CTE fields (MTE, railroads) there are skilled professionals that have experience and have come up the ranks, without having a college degree, that are faculty members with strong qualities, strong mentors and an asset to the College and its students. The implication in the resolution is that getting a degree is the only way to receive certain skills.

Connie provided that this topic requires additional debate and consideration and will be placed on the agenda of the next Academic Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:56 p.m.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: February 16, 2010, Noon – 1 p.m.
Resolution 3.0

Whereas the Academic Senate of Sacramento City College is cognizant of critical reductions in state apportionment to the Los Rios District during these difficult economic times, and

Whereas we express a full desire to collaborate with Administration to preserve the academic integrity of our College community and the fiscal soundness of our College and our District, and

Whereas we understand current budget realities necessitate diminished course offerings for a temporary period of time, cuts all stakeholders find painful because each class removed from our schedule impacts student success, and

Whereas we believe the only professional and effective way to distribute section loss is through open dialogue and good-faith collaboration between instructional departments and Administration, and

Whereas we are assured distinctions of pedagogical value are best determined by those who hold discipline-specific expertise, the instructional and counseling faculty who serve and nourish our student population on a daily basis,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Sacramento City College believes that any particular course elimination or conversion should be the result of interest-based communication between the targeted department and Administration,

Be it further resolved that while Administration may present the percentage of course reductions required from a particular division, the loss or conversion of any particular section should only occur after meaningful collaboration with the department’s chair acting as representative for his or her department’s faculty.

We, the Academic Senate of Sacramento City College, present this Resolution with legitimate faith in the interest-based collaboration for which this District has long been known.
Resolution 4.0

Whereas the Academic Senate of Sacramento City College is cognizant of critical reductions in state apportionment to the Los Ríos District during these difficult economic times, and

Whereas we express a full desire to collaborate with Administration to preserve the academic integrity of our College community and the fiscal soundness of our College and our District, and

Whereas we understand current budget realities necessitate temporary reductions in course offerings, cuts that all stakeholders find painful because each class removed from our schedule impacts student success, and

Whereas we believe the only professional and effective way to distribute section loss is through open dialogue and good-faith collaboration between Faculty and Administration, and

Whereas we are confident that distinctions of pedagogical value are best determined by those who hold discipline-specific expertise, the Faculty who serve and nourish our student population on a daily basis,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Sacramento City College believes that any particular course elimination or conversion should be the result of interest-based communication between the Faculty and Administration,

Be it further resolved that while Administration may present the percentage of course reductions required from a particular division, the loss or conversion of any particular section should only occur after meaningful dialogue between Faculty and Administration.

We, the Academic Senate of Sacramento City College, present this Resolution with legitimate faith in the interest-based approach for which this District has long been known.
2010 CCSSE Survey Timeline
(Community College Survey of Student Engagement)

Note: There are some steps that aren't shown in this handout...those are additional tasks to be performed by the Campus Coordinator.

- Campus Coordinator – Marybeth Buechner
- Survey Administrators – Anne Danenberg, Rose Fassett (and possibly others TBA)
- The P.R.I.E. Committee (Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness) kindly requests that senators share the highlighted dates with their divisions.
  Thank you very much!

- CCSSE will provide concrete data relevant to many of the college's goals, especially goals centered on student success.

- What is the CCSSE and who uses it?
  "CCSSE" stands for the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. It is a nationally recognized survey that measures various aspects of student's engagement with their college studies. In 2008 a total of 585 institutions across the US and Canada conducted the survey. This includes 47 colleges classified as "extra-large institutions" with 15,000 or more credit students; SCC is one of those extra-large colleges.

- What is "student engagement"?
  The term student engagement is used to refer to the extent to which a student actively engages in his/her education and work at the college. It includes aspects of active learning, individual effort, academic challenge, interactions with faculty, and use of college support services. An engaged student will feel a personal connection to the college and a commitment to his/her studies there. CCSSE defines student engagement as "the amount of time and energy that students invest in meaningful educational practices."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>CCSSE sends Procedure Guide to college.</td>
<td>Nov. 9</td>
<td>CCSSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>College sends President's Memo to all faculty, staff, and administrators.</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9</td>
<td>CCSSE sends an Excel file with randomly selected courses for survey administration. (Approx. 99 out of 3,000 sections will be randomly selected.)</td>
<td>Feb. 8 - Mar. 12</td>
<td>CCSSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 10</td>
<td><strong>Campus Coordinator sends memo to faculty whose classes have been selected.</strong></td>
<td>Feb. 8 - Mar.12</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 11</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator ensures President's Memo is sent to students so that they are aware of the CCSSE survey.</td>
<td>Feb. 15 - Mar. 12</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 13</td>
<td>Survey Administrator contacts the faculty members and schedules a day to administer the survey.</td>
<td>Feb. 15 - Mar. 5</td>
<td>Survey Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 14</td>
<td><strong>In-class survey administration.</strong></td>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Survey Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 15</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator returns completed surveys to CCSSE.</td>
<td>Weekly in March/April</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSE National Report</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>CCSSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§§3410. Minimum Qualifications for Instructors of Credit Courses, Counselors, and Librarians.

The minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member teaching any credit course, or as a counselor or librarian, shall be satisfied by meeting any one of the following requirements:

(a) Possession of a master's degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in the discipline of the faculty member's assignment.

(b) Possession of a master's degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in a discipline reasonably related to the faculty member's assignment and possession of a bachelor's degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in the discipline of the faculty member's assignment.

(c) For faculty assigned to teach courses in disciplines where the master's degree is not generally expected or available, but where a related bachelor's or associate degree is generally expected or available, possession of either:

   (1) a bachelor's degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment or equivalent foreign degree plus two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment; or

   (2) an associate degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment or equivalent foreign degree plus six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment.

(d) For faculty assigned to teach courses in disciplines where the master's degree is not generally expected or available, and where a related bachelor's or associate degree is not generally expected or available, possession of either:

   (1) any bachelor's degree or equivalent foreign degree plus two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment; or

   (2) any associate degree or equivalent foreign degree plus six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment.
State Academic Senate Breakout Session on MinQuals for Faculty

Pros
1. Simplifies hiring process
2. Gives student a broad perspective of what to expect re: education past an AA
3. AA gives general perspective and helps understand how college works
4. There is a value in GE courses
5. Want our faculty to have a broader set of skills other than job experience (AA give that)
6. Not having AA is philosophical contradiction to what we expect of our students
7. Collegial competency

Cons
1. Degree required to teach in field, yet not needed to actually practice (work) skill
2. Maintain local control
3. Expertise in area
4. Lose flexibility
5. Apprenticeship programs
6. Potential impact on partnerships
7. Unclear definition of associates
8. Emerging programs (Green Technology, etc.)
9. Don’t make big government fix or change local control
10. Getting “lifelong” learning skills at their companies

Alternative
1. Candidates have certificate after certificate (outside certificates) and some college background, but no degree—have years of experience instead.
2. Emenise in the field—should not be sole reason for EQ
3. Trade school certification
4. Alternate college course work
5. External certificates more rigorous than AA
6. Bolstering EQ standards—use teaching experience as part of EQ and experience. Thus making EQ more stringent.
7. Need provisional process
8. Meaningful EQ process—better defined EQ’s