

**MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Grossmont College**

**Monday, September 15, 2014 in Room 53-553 11:30 – 12:10**

(ATTENDEES)

**I. Call to Order—Sue Gonda**

**A. Approval of Agenda**

M/S/U Wirig/Working

**B. Approval of Joint Senate Minutes from August 14, 2014**

M/S/U Wirig/Pereira

**II. President’s Report – Sue Gonda**

Sue Gonda’s term as Academic Senate President will conclude at the end of this year. An election will be held in November to elect the next A.S. President. All who are interested in the position are encouraged to speak to Sue.

**III. Review of Senate Charge and the “10 Plus 1”**

There are two faculty representative organizations on campus, the union and the Academic Senate. Each has their own jurisdiction. A description of the Academic Senate was distributed (Handout A) and the 10 areas under the purview of the Senate was reviewed by Sue as a reminder of the roles and responsibilities of the Academic Senate. The goal of Senate committees, as a part of the larger Academic Senate, are to carry out these “10+1” items.

**IV. Action Items – Sue Gonda**

**A. ACCJC Follow-Up Report**

A motion was made for the Senate to endorse the ACCJC Follow-Up Report.

M/S/U Abshier/Davies-Morris

The report would not have been possible without the hard work of all involved, as listed in the Report. The report details how the College is addressing the six recommendations it received during its accreditation visit.

- Recommendation #1 focused on institutional effectiveness. ACCJC requires that the College set more “benchmarks or targets” in regard to institutional effectiveness. During the Spring Planning forum, these targets were discussed during breakout sessions. Then the Institutional Excellence Council formalized the targets for our planning and this report. The goal is to have targets that are reachable, but also aim for improvement.
- Recommendation #2 suggested that the College centralize information for students, particularly the grievance process, so that it would be easier for them to find. Student Affairs has addressed this recommendation and created a new webpage where important information is centrally located for students.

- Recommendation #3 discussed staffing and employees and making sure that the College has a sufficient number of faculty, staff and administrators. Cuyamaca received a similar recommendation, so the District has hired a consultant group to conduct staffing analysis for all three sites. Three comparative colleges were selected for Grossmont, Cuyamaca, and the District in this study. Data collection has concluded and the report will be posted when it becomes available. Dr. Cooke is currently going through the report and adding bullet points to add context for those areas that appear to have anomalies, but in reality have rather simple explanations when the comparison of colleges is thrown off by dissimilar division structures. By the end of this year, the college will work with the consultants to create a Staffing Plan that will work in conjunction with our College Planning and the Staffing Committees.
- Recommendation #4 is the only recommendation where the College needs to correct a deficiency. Everyone responsible for student learning must have in their evaluation that they are participating in who is evaluated is paying attention to Student Learning Outcomes. Administrators already have this in their evaluations, but faculty do not, as this is a negotiated issue. A Tentative Agreement has been negotiated between AFT and the District that includes the wording of this information. However, the Evaluation Form is still being finalized with a task force of AFT-Senate reps. A checkbox will be added to the form stating that the faculty member has participated in the assessment and discussion of SLOs. More to come on details about this. For now, we are telling ACCJC that it is in negotiations, but that there is agreement about the checkbox. [ADDENDUM: The Tentative Agreement detail is online at [tinyurl.com/GCCCD2014](http://tinyurl.com/GCCCD2014). The SLO checkbox will be on the evaluation summary report which we all sign when the student/peer/manager evaluations are compiled. The statement at the checkbox will state: "I have participated in the assessment of student learning outcomes and discussions with colleagues about using the information to improve teaching and learning." Also in answer to the question during our discussion: only tenure-track faculty will be required to write a self-reflection for their evaluation. It will be optional for all other faculty.]
- Recommendation #5 stated that Board Policies and Procedures should be reviewed every six years. The District governance councils have already begun work on updating and reviewing all out-of-date policies.
- Recommendation #6 suggested that the duties of the College and the District should be better defined for employees. A streamlined document has been drafted by Chris Hill to easily delineate the different duties of the College and District.

## V. Information Items

### A. Student Success and Support Plan (SSSP) for Grossmont College

Matriculation funds are being replaced by SSSP funds. New legislation regarding student success states that all students entering the College should be matriculated right away and provided with support to succeed. The State will give the College up to \$2 million dollars in 2:1 matching funds if the College supplies an accounting for each of the SSSP services that it provides. In order to receive

all \$2 million, the College must come up with \$4 million in matching funds this year without going over the "50% Law" which states that 50% of the College's funding must go directly to instruction and not services. The SSSP report is due in October.

Meeting adjourned at 12:07pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, September 15, 2014 at 11:00-12:20 in Griffin Gate