

Academic Senate Meeting July 18, 2023

Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.

Voltaire Villanueva (1943)
Robert Cormia (1943)
Patrick Morriss (1943)
Mona Rawal (1943)
Allison Meezan (1943)
Jordan Fong (1943)
Elaine Kuo (1943)

Stephanie Chan online
Lauri Scolari (E)1.3 (l)-online1 (ne K)1.3 (uo)TJ0 TnSTJ0 Tc 5uo
Nicole Nguyen online

Agenda was adopted by consensus

Consent calendar - we need to add the summer cabinet to the consent calendar. The consent calendar was adopted by consensus (Morriss, Fong)

Laurie Scolari - Guided Pathways Nova Work Plan - Fatima is the new GP facilitator. Laurie is presenting a version of the plan, and would appreciate feedback within a week to get edits and submitted. Next round of funding for faculty to participate in guided pathways work, we're in the beginning part of the second 5-year period. The report is asking what is our work around equity, and about retention. Laurie mentioned that we don't have an updated master plan to feed data into the report.

Stephanie commented that the GP report feels a bit like a draft. Laurie commented that we get the funding no matter what. Laurie commented that the report isn't high-stakes, and we should do the best that we can. Cormia asked about the education master plan, Elaine Kuo clarified that we need to update the current education master plan. Elaine commented that we're also working on the mission statement, work that will be continuing into fall. The bulk of our narrative, shared in the ICER, is that we're continuing work on the mission statement, and we're working on the master plan from September 2023, and working all the way through the end of calendar year 2024. We're preparing to show the accreditation team in a fall 2024 effort. Alison commented that the report currently reads very much like a draft, and as a public facing document, we should have a document that represents the College (publicly) in the best way.

Voltaire commented that the document (report) reads in a very "deficit" minded way. As an example, the observation that many students don't know they have to apply for graduation. Voltaire commented that there are also human resource and capital (budget issues). Stephanie commented that there are issues to address, but how far do we dive into weeds, and how do we

word “deficit” issues? Fatima commented that the document is more reflective than public facing. Again, there was a reminder that our funding isn’t dependent on the document. Patrick added that it was clear that this was a reflective document, and complemented anonymous authors for accuracy in some reflective comments. Patrick commented further that the insights in the math department are growing in an equity transformative manner, and respectively ask for some shelter to give an organic process the time that it needs to happen. How has the College moved, as a whole, on initiatives like the zero textbook cost.

Voltaire asked if the College has a continuous improvement plan, and then commented that the program review process has that built into it. Voltaire asserted that we may have that, but also that he will request feedback from faculty, but the document is due next week. Laurie commented that there was a transition in leadership in the process, Fatima has joined, but as a result we had to ask the Chancellor’s office for an extension. Patrick commented this was a very big effort, with only 3 weeks, agreed that we have a continuous improvement structure, we can call it program review, and build on some efforts in progress. Fatima commented that in the past these reports weren’t run through Academic Senate, but (and) perhaps this effort should be run through Academic Senate, and find an organized way to factor in AS.

Voltaire asked Laurie what the timeline is, but if we have three weeks to work on it (cabinet and

Faculty Union, because it's a workload issue. Allison also talked about opening day and department meetings, and that we should take the time for RSI.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.