I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA 
(1 min.) 
It was agreed that business item 4 be discussed first.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (September 28, 2012) 
(2 min.) 
Tabled. 
A discussion ensued regarding the appropriateness of including a narrative when consensus is reached or not reached on a business item. Further discussion was deemed necessary before the 9/28 minutes could be approved.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: All public comments will be limited to three minutes in length for each speaker. Opportunities for public comment will also be provided for each agenda item during discussion on each item and before proposals are called for approval.

IV. BUSINESS AGENDA: Be sure to discuss these items with your division faculty so you can adequately represent your division in reaching consensus on these items.

1. Academic Senate By-laws Revisions/Updates 
(15 min.)

Background: The Academic Senate leadership proposes some changes in the Academic Senate by-laws to the duties of the offices of President and Vice-President to ensure the smooth and sustained functioning of the Academic Senate. In general, the proposed changes are to:

1. Transfer the duties of “Treasurer” from the Vice-President to the President. The reason for this change is that the President, not the V.P. signs for disbursements from the Academic Senate account. These duties are of relatively infrequent occurrence and will not over burden the President.
2. Transfer the duties of “Secretary” to the Vice President. These duties would include taking minutes at Academic Senate Council meetings, ensuring that all agendas and minutes are publicly distributed, and to maintain (or in consultation with the president) the maintenance of all electronic communications and information sharing resources approved by the Academic Senate Council for use by the Academic Senate. These duties are not delegated in the current by-laws, and to ensure their sustainability, should be explicitly listed.

Additionally, language in the by-laws was updated to reflect current titles and practices. The proposed changes to the Academic Senate by-laws are attached to the e-mail with this agenda. If there are additional proposed changes to the by-laws or updates to language/practices that we may have missed, please bring those to the meeting.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council will review and provide feedback on the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate by-laws as presented at the September 28th Academic Senate Council meeting.

CONSENSUS REACHED
Feedback: should add language stipulating two signatures needed for checks and the president cannot sign a check reimbursing the president.

2. Academic Senate President and Vice President Elections (10 min.)

Background: As stipulated in the Academic Senate Bylaws, “elections for officers shall occur during the fall semester prior to beginning of the term” of office. Both terms of office for the Academic Senate President and Vice President end on June 30, 2012. Therefore, elections for both these officer positions for the term beginning July 1, 2012 need to occur this fall. As has been past practice, the Academic Senate Council has formed an Elections Task Force to organize and conduct elections for the positions of Academic Senate President and Vice President.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the formation of an Elections Task Force to organize and conduct elections during the Fall 2012 semester for the positions of Academic Senate President and Vice President.

CONSENSUS REACHED
Katy Neidhart volunteered to head up the task force.

3. Class Caps Policy (10 min.)

Background: A concern has been raised that the Policy for Establishing and Modifying Course Caps that the Academic Senate Council approved on March 25, 2011, does not take into account the establishment of course caps due to outside agency regulations and/or applicable law. A proposed solution to this concern is to add a fifth item to the policy under “Principles for the Initial Establishment and for Modification of Course Caps” that states; “Provisions of this policy are subject to outside agency regulation and/or applicable law, and in consultation with the dean, division chair, and potentially impacted faculty.” The Policy for Establishing and Modifying Course Caps is included in Appendix A with this additional item listed in red and italicized font for your reference.
Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the addition to the Policy for Establishing and Modifying Course Caps as presented in Appendix A with feedback provided at the October 12, 2012 meeting.

The proposed item was modified to remove the phrase “and in consultation with the dean, division chair, and potentially impacted faculty”

CONSENSUS REACHED on the modified proposal.

4. SLOCCCD Participatory Governance: Decision-Making and Committee Handbook (30 min.)

Background: The SLOCCCD Strategic Plan 2012-2014, Institutional Goal 3 states, “The San Luis Obispo County Community College District will assess and improve the quality and effectiveness of its participatory governance and decision-making structures and processes.” Furthermore, Institutional Objective 3.1 asserts that the college will, “Develop and distribute an institutional decision-making handbook that clarifies and documents the purpose, membership, meeting schedule, and reporting structure of its participatory governance and decision-making bodies.”

A Task Force appointed by the Strategic Plan Committee over a year ago has been working on developing a draft of this decision-making handbook, which built on the information collected from the Governance Retreat held in January 2011. The next step in the process is to circulate this handbook through the appropriate committees and constituencies for feedback and input. Feedback is due to the President’s Office by Friday, November 9. All feedback will then be sent to the task force for consideration and College Council will approve the final version of the SLOCCCD Participatory Governance: Decision-Making and Committee Handbook.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council will provide feedback on the SLOCCCD Participatory Governance: Decision-Making and Committee Handbook

Modified: The Academic Senate Council will provide feedback on the SLOCCCD Participatory Governance: Decision-Making and Committee Handbook and requests that the handbook return to the Academic Senate Council for approval.

CONSENSUS REACHED

Feedback:
- Overall feedback about handbook was positive. A document of this kind is very much needed
- p. 2: remove unexplained asterisks
- p. 5-6: Academic Senate should be included in the list of Central Committees to make it clear that the Academic Senate has the final say in academic and professional matters
  - Rebuttal to the above suggestion: There are only 2 centralized committees: P&B and College Council, both of which have CCFT and ASC recommendation.
  - Subsequent suggestion was to come up with language that the central committee action may not usurp the authority of the Academic Senate
- P2: should be Institutional effectiveness, not research
- P2: remove “with the support of the Office of the President.” to “agreement” throughout the document.
• Suggested adding more welcoming, inspiring language to the introduction.
• P 5: add to “rely primarily” “and mutual”
• Once the final draft of the manual is approved, the Committee Membership List and AP 4021 will have to be modified for consistency
• Academic Senate should be one of the bodies that approves the final draft of the manual because it is a decision making handbook and falls under the 10+1 (mutual agreement).
• Additional comments from J. Hoffman and B. Dumas were sent directly to the Task Force chairs for their consideration.

V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: These are future and potential future agenda items (they are not in any order of importance). You do not need to discuss these items with your division faculty at this point. If there is an item that you are interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

SUMMIT

➢ New Faculty Orientation

Summary: On May 11, 2012 the Academic Senate Council approved the proposal; “The Academic Senate Council requests that the Faculty Professional Development Committee survey recently hired faculty to find out what was useful, what wasn't and what they wish the new faculty orientation contained, and report these findings back to the Academic Senate Council at a future meeting.”

Action: None at this point. This will come back as a future agenda item.

➢ Update of BP/AP 7150 – Administrator Evaluation

Summary: On May 11, 2012 the Academic Senate Council provided the following feedback on the proposed revisions from Cabinet and the proposed new changes to Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 7150 for administrator evaluations.

• This policy raises a conceptual question that should be brought back to all faculty for consideration before any policy is adopted: “What role should faculty play in evaluating administrators?”
• Faculty need to be more educated about the process.
• Faculty evaluations could be summarized or filtered to omit inappropriate or unprofessional comments.
• The process of gathering faculty feedback needs to be conducted in a way that guarantees each faculty member can submit only one evaluation.

Action: None at this point. This will come back as a future agenda item.

➢ Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Procedure

Summary: College Council completed the process of using the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance procedure on the Fashion Design program last year. The outcome of that process was a recommendation to College Council, which was approved to revitalize that problem. After going through the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance procedure it was suggested that this procedure be assessed to identify areas where
revisions and clarifications may be needed to this procedure. A task force of College Council has been established to conduct this assessment and propose modifications to the procedure to College Council.

Action: None at this point. This will be a future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

➤ Role and Responsibilities of Faculty and Administrators with Accreditation, Governance, and Planning

Summary: There continue to be confusion about the role and responsibilities of different individuals related to accreditation, governance and planning at Cuesta. We are going to have to continue dialoging and documenting what we as faculty see as our role in these areas and what we expect of our administrators, so that in the future, roles, responsibilities, and expectations are clear.

Action: None at this point. This is a potential future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

➤ Employee Workplace Bullying

Summary: Concerns have been raised about incidents of bullying among employees that have occurred, and in some cases are continuing to occur at Cuesta. The Academic Senate leadership has been asked to consider developing a resolution regarding bullying or workplace harassment among employees and to ultimately develop a policy that addresses workplace bullying.

Action: None at this point. This will be a future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

➤ Activities on FLEX Days

Summary: The recent request to hold a Strategic Planning retreat on Friday, October 7 (a FLEX day) has lead to controversy about the types of activities that should be scheduled on FLEX days.

Action: None at this point. This will be a future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

➤ F Grade for Students

Summary: At some point we may want to address the issue of the F grade for students who simply disappear or fail to show up. We currently calculate student success and retention based on faulty data because we don’t have a way of distinguishing between students who do not pass the class and those who simply fail to show up. In the past, this issue was discussed between the Senate Council and the administration. The possibility of a W/F grade was proposed. This still remains an important issue.

Action: None at this point. This is a potential future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.
VI. INFORMATION ITEMS: Please share these items with your division faculty.

1. Strategic Planning, Web, and Planning and Budget Committees – There are open faculty spots on the Strategic Planning, Web, and the Planning and Budget Committees. If you are interested in serving on one of these committees or know someone who might be, please let Kevin Bontenbal know. The Strategic Planning Committee meets the second and fourth Mondays of the month from 2:00 – 3:30 pm, the Web Committee meets the 3rd Wednesday of the month from 3:30 – 5:00 pm, and Planning and Budget meets the first and third Tuesdays of the month from 3:00 – 4:30 pm.

2. Summit Agenda/Minutes – The agenda from the October 4 Summit meeting is attached to the e-mail with this agenda.

3. Faculty Manual Status – Work on the on-line Faculty Manual has been delayed due to the need to wait for Computer Services to determine what on-line platform will be available for its development. Computer Services is now considering a wiki application within SharePoint as an appropriate platform which may be available as early as this fall. Computer Services decided not to adopt Wikispaces as the campus standard. Therefore, the Faculty Manual that was partially developed on that platform will need to be converted.

VII. SUMMIT ITEMS
Are there any items, campus issues, and/or divisional concerns/issues that anyone has that he/she feels need to be taken to “Summit” for answers/clarification?

Concerns were expressed regarding Dr. Stork’s interpretation of his role in the program discontinuance and revitalization policy (AP 4021). Concerns that he is circumventing the policy by not presenting a list of criteria for the program selected for discontinuance (other than fiscal issues). Dr. Stork has indicated he will trump the process if it takes too long and has indicated that he will make a request of the College Council to modify the policy. This is not within the purview of College Council, they implement the process but Academic Senate Council is responsible for any revisions. Also there was concern that this will be a violation of accreditation standards and could potentially impact our accreditation status as we are not following our integrated planning model.

VIII. STANDING REPORTS (Time permitting – max. 3 min. per report)

1. CCFT—Merzon
2. Curriculum—Moore
3. College Council—Bontenbal
4. Planning & Budget—Hoffman/Bontenbal
5. Summit—Bontenbal/Hoffman
6. FSA Committee—Bontenbal
7. Basic Skills Initiative—Miller
8. SLOA Committee—Baxley/Demarest
9. Equivalency Committee—Scovil
10. Faculty Manual Task Force—Hoffman
11. FPDC—Silverberg
12. Book of the Year—Love
13. IPPR—Harris
14. Sabbatical Leave—McConnico

CCFT: outrageous to expect that faculty salary should be sacrificed to pay for college operations. Principled stand based on the amount of dollars that have been spent on administrator buyouts. Willing to look at collaborative ways to save dollars by identifying areas we can save (supplies; role lottery dollars into contingency funds). Supporting David Baldwin for Board of Trustees; he has a strong union background and is not tied to the old guard of Cuesta.

Curriculum: ACJCC may pick courses out of the catalogue to survey the SLOs and trying to reconcile the course listings – courses no longer being taught have been deleted from CurricuNet and from the catalogue. Have to update textbook listings to make sure that a representative text is listed there.

Next Meeting: Friday, November 2 | 2:30 pm | Room 3219 (Library)
APPENDIX A

Policy for Establishing and Modifying Course Caps

Definitions

1. **Course Caps** are the maximums for student enrollment for all sections of a course as listed on the Course Outline of Record for each course.

2. **Enrollment Maximums** are the total number of students that can enroll in a section of a course due to campus site, classroom size, or modality. Fill rates for individual sections of a course are to be determined by the enrollment maximum for a course, not the course cap, because the course cap may be higher than the classroom size allows.

Principles for the Initial Establishment and for Modification of Course Caps

1. Course caps will be established initially by using the current enrollment maximums as reflected in Banner for each course. These enrollment maximums will become the official course caps for all courses and will be listed on the Course Outline of Record (COR) for each course. For courses that have different enrollment maximums, either by semester or based on physical limitations at a particular campus site, the greater enrollment maximum will be used for the initial establishment of the course cap.

2. Course caps, preexisting or revised, are the maximums for student enrollment for a given course across all campus sites. Where physical limitations at a particular campus site make accommodating an established course cap maximum impossible, a lower enrollment maximum may be used for that course for that location without modifying the maximum course cap that is listed on the COR for a given course across all campus sites and modalities.

3. Faculty members have the authority to submit a major course revision to the Curriculum Committee to modify the existing course cap based on the criteria outlined below with the consent of their fellow division faculty and with appropriate documentation.

4. If the Curriculum Committee approves a major course revision to modify a course cap, then the new course cap will become the official maximum for student enrollment for that course and will be listed as such on the Course Outline of Record (COR), effective the following semester after approval.

5. Provisions of this policy are subject to outside agency regulation and/or applicable law, and in consultation with the dean, division chair, and potentially impacted faculty.

Process for Changing Existing Course Caps

1. Division faculty may submit a major course revision to the Curriculum Committee to modify an existing course cap based on established criteria as explained below, each of which must be supported and/or justified with appropriate documentation. One criterion is required, but two or more are recommended for justification of a Course Cap modification proposal to the Curriculum Committee.

2. Based on the criteria for the modification of course caps listed below, the appropriate documentation to support a proposal to change a course cap may include, but is not limited to, the following:
   A. Comparative research of caps for similar courses at other California community colleges;
   B. Recommendations or requirements from a professional or academic publication or organization; and/or
   C. Course specific documentation, such as course syllabus, assignment criteria, SLOs, and objectives.

3. Proposals to change the existing course cap for a course will be reviewed by the Class Caps Sub-committee of the Curriculum Committee. This sub-committee will review the proposal to determine whether or not the proposed change and supporting documentation are consistent with the established criteria for the modification of a course cap and make a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee as to whether the course cap should be modified. The Curriculum Committee will make the final decisions regarding the proposal to change the existing enrollment maximum for a course.
Criteria for the Modification of Course Caps

Modifications to a course cap must be justified with one of the below criteria, and it is recommended that two or more criteria be considered in a proposal to modify a course cap. Under each criterion below, suggested examples are provided of the types of data that may be used to justify a modification to a course cap. In addition, faculty members who propose a new course to the Curriculum Committee can opt to establish the course cap based on the course cap of a similar course(s) within the discipline or based on one or more of the below criteria:

A. Health and Safety
   - Fire codes
   - Supervision: Number of students who can be safely supervised by available faculty and/or staff within a classroom when the students are undertaking hazardous activities or working with hazardous equipment.

B. Facility or Other Class Capacity Limitations
   - Availability of seats, desks, or workstations
   - Availability of equipment or supplies
   - Availability of required or necessary teaching or lab assistants

C. Course Modality
   - Lab courses vs. combined lecture and lab courses – course caps may be determined differently for labs, which may have different limitations compared to lecture-only courses.

D. Instructional Delivery
   - Nature of classroom activities
   - Nature of interaction between instructor and students
   - Use of group work or group projects

E. Student Assessment
   - Types and/or amount of individual assignments, projects, and/or papers to assess
   - Methods of student assessment, feedback, or evaluation
   - Course-level or Program-level Student Learning Outcomes
   - Course objectives in the COR

F. Use of Existing Course Cap for a similar course(s) within the discipline
   - For new courses only -- can not be used as one of the required criteria for modifying an existing course cap
   - New course should be comparable (i.e. objectives, topics and scope, assignment, assessment, and pedagogy) to other course(s) in the discipline