I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (1 min.)

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (March 22, 2013) (2 min.)

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.

Carina Love announced that the Book of the Year event was a great success and is asking that suggestions for next year’s book be forwarded to her.

Lauren Milborne from the marketing department is requesting that faculty forward stories to her about students who are graduating this year.

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. New District Mission Statement (15 min.)

   **Background:** At its March 8, 2013 meeting the Academic Senate Council provided feedback on a proposed new district mission statement (see March 8, 2013 agenda or minutes for further background information on this item). After considering feedback received, the ad hoc mission statement group have revised the previous draft mission statement to its current form as presented in Appendix A. This is coming back to the Academic Senate Council for a recommendation to College Council who will then forward a recommendation to the Superintendent/President who will then take to the Board of Trustees for approval.
Proposal: The Academic Senate Council recommends approval of the new *SLOCCCD Mission Statement* as presented in Appendix A to College Council with feedback provided at the April 12, 2013 meeting.

**Consensus Reached. No additional feedback was provided.**

2. MOOCs Resolution (10 min.)

**Background:** At its March 8, 2013 meeting the Academic Senate Council provided feedback on a proposed resolution regarding Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). MOOCs are basically large scale online courses that may contain hundreds of students (see March 8, 2013 agenda or minutes for further background information on this item). Appendix B is an updated draft (taking into consideration feedback from the March 8, 2013 Academic Senate Council meeting) of a possible resolution on MOOCs for the Academic Senate Council to consider.

**Proposal:** The Academic Senate Council approves the resolution *Opposed the Offering of any Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) until Adequate Investigation and Determination of their Appropriateness by Faculty has Occurred* as presented in Appendix B with feedback provided at the April 12, 2013 meeting.

**Consensus Reached. No additional feedback was provided.**

3. Introduction to the Academic Senate SharePoint site for Council Members (20 min.)

**Background:** At the November 28, 2012 meeting, the Academic Senate Council approved the use of a SharePoint site as a document management and communications tool and appointed the Academic Senate Vice-President as the site administrator. The Academic Senate leadership is now ready to conduct a training to orient the council to the site and to use the site to make information available for future meetings. The training consists of the following (see attachment included in the e-mail with this agenda):

- site access, both through the campus network, and remotely
- basic site navigation
- site permission settings
- accessing information and documents via “lists and Libraries”

**Proposal:** The Academic Senate Council approves the Academic Senate SharePoint site design with feedback provided at the April 12, 2013 meeting.

**Consensus Reached. No additional feedback was provided.**

4. On-line Faculty Handbook (10 min.)

**Background:** At its November 2, 2012 meeting the Academic Senate Council designated the SharePoint wiki tool for the development of an electronic faculty handbook. The change to an online handbook was approved at the August 26, 2011 Academic Senate Council meeting. The Academic Senate By-Laws (revised Fall 2012) state that the Academic Senate Vice-President “shall maintain, or in consultation with the President, delegate the maintenance of all electronic
communication and information sharing resources approved by the Academic Senate Council for use by the Academic Senate.”

The current Academic Senate Vice President (Julie Hoffman) has developed the structure and table of contents for the Handbook within the Academic Senate SharePoint site. The faculty handbook is currently accessible only to Academic Senate Council members. Feedback and approval of the table of contents (see attachment included in the e-mail with this agenda) is being requested, along with the appointment of additional content coordinators from within the Academic Senate Council for each subsection of Parts 2 and 3 of the Faculty Handbook. Julie Hoffman, the current Academic Senate Vice President volunteers herself as the content coordinator for all sub-sections of Part 1.

The duty of the coordinators will be to find content contributors for topics within their subsection of the Faculty Handbook. The content coordinators and contributors may choose to edit their sections directly in SharePoint or they may forward content in Word document format to the Academic Senate Vice-President (Julie Hoffman) for inclusion.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the table of contents for the On-Line Faculty Handbook with feedback provided at the April 12, 2013 meeting.

Consensus reached. The following feedback was provided:
- Add a cross-link to mycuesta Banner self services in Part 2A: Policies, Procedures and Resources
- Add links to information on dealing with emotionally distressed students, handling student incident reports, the children's center, and campus safety under Part 3A: Resources for You [faculty]
- Add links to the children's center, writing help center, modern language labs, and student grievance procedures under Part III C: Resources for your Students
- Separate the Counseling and EOPS links
- Re-organize the items in Part IIIIC: Resources for students so it is less cluttered.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves appointing content coordinators for sections of the On-line faculty Handbook from among Senate Council members at its April 12, 2013 meeting.

Withdrawn.

5. Full-Time Senator At-Large Position

Background: Due to unforeseen circumstances that are requiring his time on Friday afternoons, Kyi Zin, Full-time Senator At-large, is regretfully resigning from this position. As the Senate bylaws state; "Vacancies in the Officers and the at-large representatives of the Academic Senate council may be filled by appointment by the Academic Senate Council from eligible members to serve the duration of the unfulfilled term." Matt Knudsen, full-time math faculty has expressed interest in serving out the duration (through Spring 2014) of the Full-time Senator At-large position.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the appointment of Matt Knudsen to fulfill the duration of the Full-Time Senator At-Large position through Spring 2014.
Consensus reached.

6. Faculty Conference Shared Learning Form (15 min.)

Background: In Fall 2012, Interim Vice-President for Student Services Sandee McLaughlin tendered a “Conference Shared Learning Form” and attempted to mandate its adoption across all employee groups, including faculty. Academic Senate objected, and the form was immediately withdrawn from faculty use pending Senate review. In October, Kevin Bontenbal asked the Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC) to review McLaughlin’s form and evaluate its suitability for faculty use. The FPDC invited McLaughlin to its November meeting, where she explained her rationale for developing the form, which was to keep track of what knowledge and resources Cuesta employees who attend conferences or workshops might bring back to campus and be able to share with colleagues. In the closed discussion that followed, the committee agreed that McLaughlin’s proposal had merit, and that her general objectives were not unreasonable, but also concluded that most of the questions on her form were not pertinent to faculty. The FPDC resolved to author its own form that could achieve legitimate goals in a manner that focuses squarely on faculty needs and concerns, with the added benefit of systematically capturing evidence that will be helpful in the accreditation process. The result of that effort is the form (attached to the e-mail with this agenda) by the FPDC being proposed for adoption and use.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the use of the Faculty Conference Shared Learning Form developed by the Faculty Professional Development Committee with feedback provided at the April 12, 2013 meeting.

Modified: The Academic Senate Council will provide feedback on the Faculty Shared Learning Form developed by the Faculty Professional Development Committee at the April 12, 2013 meeting.

Feedback included the following and was forwarded to Bruce Silverberg, chair of the Faculty Professional Development Committee:

- Consider modifying this from in conjunction with the actual conference form, to better align both forms.
- Determine how the information that the form is designed to collect will be consolidated and disseminated.

- Consider tying its completion as a request at the front end as an acknowledged part of the complete process rather, than tying it to conference reimbursement.

- Include an explanation of why different funding sources are being asked for and how this helps with tracking where sources are being used.

- Include specific disciplines and topics in question 1 so they can be better tied to institutional goals and objectives since this is a tool for tracking accreditation standards.

7. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges’ Resolutions (15 min.)

Background: The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges’ (ASCCC) resolutions and appendices available at: http://asccc.org/session/resolutions will be debated and voted on at the
ASCCC Spring Plenary Session, April 18-20. Both the Academic Senate President and Vice President have delegate status and therefore, will be voting on these resolutions at the Plenary Session. If there are resolutions that individuals have a particular opinion about, in terms of whether the delegates should vote for or against the resolution, now would be the time to express these opinions to inform delegates on how to vote on the ASCCC resolutions.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council will provide feedback and/or advise delegates how to vote on the ASCCC resolutions.

Consensus reached. Feedback included the following:

- General support was expressed for
  9.03 S13 Conditions of Enrollment for Online Instruction
  9.04 S13 Investigate and Determine Appropriateness of Massive Open Online Courses
  19.07 S13 Certification of Faculty to Teach Distance Education Courses

8. Sabbatical Leaves (20 min.)

Background: There has been inconsistency among subsequent Sabbatical Leave Committees regarding whether or not it is appropriate for a sabbatical to be awarded to an applicant who proposes to split the sabbatical in a manner different from those outlined in BP 3251 – Sabbatical Leaves (http://academic.cuesta.org/president/2008BP/BP3000/3251.pdf) and as indicated on the Sabbatical Leave Application (attached to the e-mail with this agenda).

To summarize these documents allow for three possibilities:
  1) Single Semester Leave:
  2) Full Academic Year Leave:
  3) Split Leave (must be completed within a two-year period)

In particular, splitting a one semester leave over more than one semester so as to allow the recipient to continue to teach or perform other work related duties seems to violate the spirit of a Sabbatical leave and reduces it to release time.

It has also come into question whether the sabbatical committee can conditionally award a sabbatical pending requested changes to a candidate’s proposal. The description of the Sabbatical Leave Committee that is included in the Senate By-Laws (http://academic.cuesta.edu/acasen/Seante_Bylaws_final_11_16_2012.pdf) and BP 3251 is not clear on this point.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council affirms that a Sabbatical Leave may be split only in one of the three ways explicitly stated in BP 3251 and directs the Academic Senate Leadership to review and revise BP 3251 – Sabbatical Leaves and the Sabbatical Leave Application accordingly and bring back to the Academic Senate Council for feedback and approval at a future meeting.

Tabled due to lack of time.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council affirms that the Sabbatical Leave Committee has the authority to conditionally award a sabbatical leave pending changes requested by the committee and directs the Academic Senate Leadership to review and revise the Sabbatical Leave Committee
Description listed in the Senate Bylaws to be consistent with any revisions made to BP 3251 and bring back to the Academic Senate Council for feedback and approval at a future meeting.

Tabled due to lack of time.

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.

- **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.

- **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.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS: Please share these items with your division faculty.

1. Task Forces / Work Groups – Strategic Plan’s Institutional Objectives – Reminder, faculty are not required to serve on task forces and/or work groups to preform various work associated with our Strategic Plan’s Institutional Objectives.

2. Summit Agenda/Minutes – The minutes for the February, 7, 2013, and the March 5, 2013 Summit meetings are attached to the e-mail with this agenda.

VI. 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?

None presented.

VII. STANDING REPORTS (Time permitting – max. 3 min. per report)
Tabled due to lack of time.

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
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APPENDIX A

San Luis Obispo County Community College District
FINAL PROPOSED MISSION STATEMENT

Cuesta College is an inclusive institution that inspires a diverse student population\(^1\) to achieve their educational goals.\(^2\)

We effectively support students\(^3\) in their efforts to improve foundational skills, transfer to four-year institutions, earn certificates or associate degrees, and advance in the workforce.\(^4\)

Through dynamic and challenging learning opportunities, Cuesta College improves lives by promoting cultural, intellectual, and professional growth. We prepare students to become engaged citizens in our increasingly complex communities and world.

---

\(^1\) Diversity addressed
\(^2\) Implies to help develop goals
\(^3\) Enumerates and crystallize what we do
\(^4\) These are not weighted and not meant to imply what is or is not important, we think this reads well.
APPENDIX B

Opposed the Offering of any Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) until Adequate Investigation and Determination of their Appropriateness by Faculty has Occurred

Whereas, Serious academic and proprietary concerns have been raised regarding Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), and appropriate caution has been expressed by the president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges;

Whereas, MOOC lectures are “canned,” quizzes and testing “automated”, and students participation is “voluntary”, and students get “little” to no help from faculty—characterized by automated testing, voluntary student participation, and little student to faculty interaction;

Whereas, The MOOCs instructional paradigm works appears to work best for a small portion of self-directed learners, as evident from the fact that only 5% of students complete courses and a much smaller subset pass; by data that show only a very small percentage of students complete MOOC courses.;

Whereas, Implementation of MOOCs without consultation from the faculty presents may present a threat to shared participatory governance and academic freedom;

Whereas, Copyright clearance and intellectual property can be costly and institutions bear these responsibilities for clearing copyright and copyright violations when they partner with commercial MOOC providers. There exists the potential for costly litigation regarding copyright issues when partnering with MOOC providers; and

Whereas, MOOCs represent “teacher less classrooms” often utilize unsupervised learning environments that could undermine academic integrity and rigor;

Resolved, That the Cuesta College Academic Senate and Cuesta College Federation of Teachers oppose the offering of MOOCs until such time that the faculty have adequately investigated and determined the appropriateness of this new form of instruction at the San Luis Obispo County Community College District (SLOCCCD); and

Resolved, That if MOOCs are found to be appropriate, that the first offering of a MOOC by the SLOCCCD be done as a pilot to further test and investigate the appropriateness of MOOCs through an evaluation based on formative and summative criteria, and if appropriate, include qualitative and quantitative measurements and assessments.