IVC Academic Senate

Approved Minutes

December 2, 2009

I. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 pm by President White.

II. **Roll Call**

Present: Krista Byrd, Suzanne Gretz, Daniel Gilison, Cesar Guzman, Michael Heumann, Russell Lavery, Eric Lehtonen, Mary Lofgren, Barbara Nilson, Norma Nunez, Thomas Paine, James Patterson, Jose Ruiz, Norma Scott, Kevin White, Cathy Zazueta, Lianna Zhao, Kathy Berry, Bruce Seivertson

Excused: Jean Montenegro, Rosalba Jepson, Toni Pfister

Absent: Steven Sciaky, David Zielinski

Visitors: Taylor Ruhl, Carol Lee, Eric Jacobson, Frances Beope, Ed Gould, John Abarca

III. **Visitor Comments**

- No comments

IV. **Consent Agenda**

1. Academic Senate minutes of 11-18-09
   - M/S/C (Patterson/Zazueta) to approve the item
2. BP 2000 Setting Policy
3. BP 2010 Board Membership
4. BP 2015 Student Membership
5. BP 2016 Academic Senate Member
6. BP 2100 Board Elections
7. BP 2105 Election of Student Member
8. BP 2110 Vacancies on the Board
   - M/S (Patterson/Nilson) to approve the items as listed
   - The motion was removed and the items were pulled.

V. **Reports**

1. President
   - President White met with Dr. Gould and Vice President Berry regarding shared governance. They would meet over winter session to draft policies for shared governance on campus.
   - White also reported on information he received at the Plenary session for the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges. He noted that the state's budget was the focus for the most concern among the senators. So much is in flux that many

resolutions were pulled because not enough information was available.

2. Past President
   - Past President Seivertson expressed a concern about the calendar. He asked about the status of the 2010-2011 academic calendar sub-committee.
   - Senator Gretz stated that the sub-committee would be meeting on December 3, and they would come up with various plans for the calendar that would be discussed at the meeting and which would be brought to the Senate in Spring.
3. Treasurer
   - $5,751.06
4. VP of Instruction
   - Berry announced that the accreditation team accepted our progress report and decided that a visit was not needed at this time.
   - The midterm accreditation self-study is due March 15, however, and the commission would meet in January to determine if we will be removed from warning status.
   - Berry would like to establish a Continuous Accreditation Ready Team. The team would have about twenty members. She would like to have about ten to twelve faculty members participating on this team.
   - Berry asked that faculty turn grades in on time.

VI. **Academic and Professional Matters**

1. SDSU Resolution—support to rescind admission policy
   - M/S (Nilson/Nunez) to approve the resolution.
   - This was the first reading of this resolution.
   - Senators and visitors discussed many details about the wording and the purpose of this resolution.
   - Senator Lavery suggested that we hold the second reading immediately so we do not wait until Spring semester to vote on this.
   - Senator Patterson moves to suspend the rules and move forward to the second reading of this resolution. Senator Guzman seconded. The motion to suspend the rules was approved.
   - On a roll-call vote, the resolution was approved with thirteen yes votes and four no.
2. Cesar Chavez Resolution—advocacy for establishing birthday recognition
   - M/S (Nunez/Guzman) to approve the resolution.
   - This was the first reading of this resolution.

- Senators discussed many details regarding the language in the resolution as well as the logistics of establishing this as a holiday.

3. Contingent (part-time) Faculty Resolution—developing a comprehensive approach
   - M/S (Heumann/Lofgren) to approve the resolution.
   - This was the first reading of the resolution.
   - Senators discussed the language in the resolution and discussed the potential ways that the training program outlined in the resolution could be realized.
4. Shared Governance—developing a collegial approach for academic restructuring
   - Eric Jacobson presented a systematic collegial proposal for academic restructuring. The goal of this process is to build consensus for restructuring.
   - M/S (Lavery/Gretz) that the Senate will explore reorganization processes.
   - Senator Lavery asked who would create the Academic Structure Working Group that is at the heart of this reorganization plan.
   - Other senators asked questions about the current reorganization and how that applies to this proposal for a new reorganization plan. How, they ask, does this proposal work in light of the fact that the reorganization of academic services has already begun?
   - Dr. Gould stated that he was interested in hearing the concerns of Senate members regarding the reorganization as they are currently being planned.
   - The senators expressed concerns about how the reorganization process has been handled to this point, and many agreed that a central group to discuss the many questions connected to reorganization is a good idea.
   - Dr. Gould agreed that forming an Academic Structure Working Group is a good idea, but he also expressed surprise that so many people are so confused by reorganization since so much of the information has been distributed throughout the campus through many different channels.
   - The motion failed. There was one abstention.
   - M/S/C (Patterson/Nilson) that the February 17 Academic Senate meeting be devoted entirely to the reorganization issue.

IX. M/S/C (Heumann/Nilson) to adjourn the meeting at 3:31 pm.