

SENATE AGENDA
LAST REGULAR MEETING
ACADEMIC SENATE OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE

MAY 19, 1997

ROOM 370, 11:10 A.M. - 12:20 P.M.

I. PRELIMINARY ITEMS

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Agenda
- C. Approval of Minutes, May 5, 1997

II. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Resolution to accept SPRUCE recommendations re: Faculty Offices (Attachment A 5-5-97)
- B. Resolution to request the United Faculty 1. negotiate the removal of load from present and future course classifications specifically from Lab, Lecture/Lab designations, and 2. endorse a plan for load that yields "one hour of pay for one hour of teaching". - (Attachment B 4-21-97)
- C. Approve Dr. Cary Willard for Associate Professor
- D. Approve Nominations for Budget & Planning Steering Committee:
 - Steering Committee: Kats Gustafson, Craig Milgram
 - Full Committee: Barry Winn, Evan Enowitz

III. INFORMATION

- A. Report from the New Faculty Program Ad Hoc Committee (Attachment A 5-19-97)

IV. OTHER MATTERS

- A. President's Report:
 - Report on State Senate Meeting - Hoke Simpson.
- B. United Faculty Update

**Combined faculty meeting will be scheduled during Professional Development Week
in August**

**The first meeting of the Academic Senate for the 97-98 Academic Year
is scheduled for Monday, September 15, 1997**

Report of the New Faculty Program Ad Hoc Committee

As a result of more than twenty interviews with faculty members that joined Grossmont College in 1990, 1993 and 1996 the Ad Hoc Committee found some interesting commonalities.

In response to the questions that dealt with helpful/beneficial information and experiences, the most common answer was the help that the department gave them. Many answered that they had unofficial mentors that really helped get them through the first year or two on campus. These mentors provided information on Grossmont College history, the "hierarchy", how the campus operated, departmental policies and where to go for the daily operations on campus such as word processing and duplicating. Those who were interviewed would like to see more of this, and would like it formalized into a mentoring process. Several suggested a mentoring team approach. The Ad Hoc committee concurred with this.

In regard to the questions that dealt with frustrating experiences and information that was lacking when their careers began at Grossmont, the respondents had a number of suggestions. These include: 1) a more graphic knowledge of the hierarchy such as committee structure and tasks; 2) an organizational chart; 3) more campus history; 4) more information on student services including DSS, tutoring and counseling; 5) information concerning pay issues and the United Faculty contract; 6) information on Limited English Proficiency students and how to work with these students; 7) information regarding learning styles; 8) a library orientation, including computer lab; 9) clear and detailed information regarding WSCH, FTE and LED and what it really means to the individual instructor and department; 10) information and consistency regarding tenure review and tenure; 11) more opportunities to interact with people from other departments; and 12) basic good teaching skills information.

As a result of the intensive interviews with these faculty, the following recommendations have been made by the Ad Hoc Committee:

1. The creation of a mentoring team consisting of tenured faculty. No faculty member who serves as a mentor may serve on the tenure review committee for the individual faculty member that is mentored. This mentoring team will meet new faculty at a social gathering to take place before Professional Development Week. This event will take place at Cathie Robertson's house on August 16 for the Fall 1997 Semester. This group will meet together as a group once more during Professional Development week to discuss questions and concerns of the new faculty members. These mentors will accompany new faculty to the Convocation and will assist them in any way necessary during that week and the rest of the semester. These mentors will assist new faculty regularly throughout the first year and on an as needed basis thereafter. If possible, the mentors will have training in peer coaching, which may be

available during Professional Development Week. There will be a written checklist agreement for the mentor and new faculty to follow.

2. The staff development coordinator will conduct a welcome/informational meeting for new faculty the Friday prior to Professional Development Week. This meeting will include a brief meeting the President, Vice-Presidents, Deans and Directors, a campus tour and brief descriptions of campus services by their staff including DSS, Tutoring and Counseling. Also provided will be information on the local community, including housing, etc., as needed by the new faculty.

3. Several mandatory meetings (5 hours total) for the new faculty that will include a tour of the library and CATL computer information, a workshop on learning styles, a workshop on LEP and an informational workshop on college hierarchy, pay issues and the United Faculty contract.

4. A list of excellent faculty that are willing to be observed in their classrooms will be solicited and made available to new faculty. New faculty will be encouraged to visit a minimum of one of these classrooms per semester to observe excellent teaching strategies. Several teaching strategy workshops will be held during the year to assist new faculty. The committee would like to see possible stipend offered for new faculty to encourage these visits.

5. The creation of a New Faculty Web Page that will offer a data base of information that includes information from the faculty handbook so that information can be easily accessed and changes can be updated. Included in this data base will be organizational charts for the hierarchical structure of committees.

6. New faculty will be encouraged to attend at least one committee meeting during each semester of their first year so that they might can first hand knowledge of committee work.

7. New faculty will be encouraged to attend at least one Academic Senate meeting per semester of their first year to observe the activities that take place in the Senate for greater understanding.

RESOLUTION: 4-18-97 DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

WHEREAS the Grossmont College Academic Senate has charged the Curriculum Committee to form operational definitions for LAB, LECTURE and LECTURE/LAB, and

WHEREAS the Curriculum Committee has attempted to form these definitions that better meet the needs of Grossmont College, while keeping with the mandates of the Ed Code and Title Five, and

WHEREAS the Curriculum Committee using these definitions must constantly wrestle with issues in the interest of academic integrity and is often perceived as "obstructionist" or "uncooperative" because of load issues, and

WHEREAS many of the curriculum changes by departments are changes that are driven by load issues, and

WHEREAS many departments withdraw from implementing innovative curriculum changes because of load issues, and

WHEREAS load issues have rendered the academic process dysfunctional and clogged the system to the point where the entire curriculum process is literally at a stand still because of load issues, and

WHEREAS the Grossmont College Academic Senate wishes to stop this intrusion of academic integrity by load issues,

BE IT RESOLVED that:

The Grossmont College Academic Senate requests that the United Faculty;

1. negotiate the removal of load from present and future course classifications, specifically from Lab, Lecture and Lecture/Lab designations.
2. endorse a plan for load that yields "one hour of pay for one hour of teaching".

The Grossmont College Academic Senate charges the Curriculum Committee to classify course offerings according to the distinction of teaching methods without the load issue attached, and with "forward" rather than a "past practice approach", including other definitions like "distance learning", etc.

To all faculty for information/clarification of the role of the Curriculum Committee

DATE: November 14, 1995
TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: The Curriculum Committee
RE: Request for support of development of operational definitions - LAB, LECTURE, LECTURE/LAB

As charged by the State-wide Academic Senate of California and the Chancellor's Office, curriculum committees serve to insure the integrity and uphold the standards of curriculum at their respective institutions. The committee at Grossmont College strives to uphold the standards established by the state-wide senate, and in doing so is often perceived as an "inquisition" committee. Recognizing the group's delegated responsibility in reviewing curriculum, faculty and administration should recognize that all facets of a course proposal and outline must be scrutinized, including: course numbers; course titles; unit value; hours (lecture, lecture/lab, lab); methods of instruction; prerequisites/corequisites/advisories on recommended preparation; catalog description; course content; course objectives; outside assignments; texts; method of evaluation; instructional facilities; special materials; fiscal impact; integration of objectives with content and description; and, implications for articulation and transfer.

When the committee approves a proposal, it endorses every aspect of the course as proposed. Sometimes, however, and rarely, a question or concern arises regarding one of the areas listed above. During these times when the committee must wrestle with issues in the interest of integrity, it is often perceived as "obstructionist" or uncooperative. Never is it the intent of the committee to stop or stagnate curriculum innovation, development or evolution, but in accepting delegated authority for curriculum review, it must adhere to the mandates of Title V and the standards established by the state-wide Academic Senate.

Having presented this overview, the Curriculum Committee seeks input and direction from the Grossmont Academic Senate in regards to one area in particular, an area with which the committee repeatedly grapples. The issue of "hours" designation, namely LECTURE, LECTURE/LAB AND LAB, perpetually arises at some point each year, with the committee often arriving at impasse with departments over disagreements regarding the status of a proposed class. All too often the unfortunate outcome of such a stalemate is the demise of a sound and meaningful course, either withdrawn from consideration by the department or denied by the committee.

Currently the committee follows the lecture and lab definitions in the California Community Colleges Management Information System Data Element Dictionary (please see attached.) In addition, committee members often consider pre-existing class formats when trying to establish an understanding of how proposed courses will be taught. Clearly, neither the definitions from the Data Element Dictionary nor subjective interpretation based on existing methods of instruction provides an infallible basis on which to make determinations regarding lecture, lecture/lab or lab. The state chancellor's office, in fact, recognizes the inadequacies of its definitions, but has yet not addressed the issue of creating definitions that accommodate innovations in teaching, such as collaborative and distance learning.

The Curriculum Committee asks the Academic Senate to charge us with the task of developing operational definitions that better meet the needs of Grossmont College. With senate support, the curriculum committee will undertake this project during the Spring, 1996, semester, and bring forth a draft to the senate for consideration.

Again, we seek direction and support from the Academic Senate in our endeavors to maintain the integrity and quality of the curriculum at Grossmont College.

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERING
METHODS OF DELIVERY

LECTURE		LECTURE/LAB (LEARNING LAB)		LAB		
STUDENT	INSTRUCTOR	STUDENT	INSTRUCTOR	STUDENT	INSTRUCTOR	
Limited group work in class based on the Carnegie Unit*	Instructor directed discussions, demonstrations and appropriate use of teaching tools	Some manipulation of equipment/computers	Philosophy of department	The majority of the work is completed in the classroom	Labs may have different space configuration and environment from a traditional classroom.	
Innovative techniques encouraged	Limited group work in class	Student focus on task or instructor	Approximately 1/3 lecture, 2/3 lab	The student practices or does hands-on work in class	There is significant one-on-one instruction	
Independent work occurs outside of class based on the Carnegie Unit*	The majority of material is presented to the class at one time	Time spent working out of class (based on the Carnegie Unit*)	Intensity of instructor guidance	Student focus on task or instructor	There is a limited number of students	
	Course is articulated as a lecture with CSU and/or UC		Application of information from lecture portion of class	Time spent working out of class (based on the Carnegie Unit*)	The class is self-guided	
			Tutorials			The class is self-paced
						Course is articulated as a lab with CSU and/or UC
						A lab could be a: 1) experimental 2) learning lab 3) practicum
						Accrediting body specifies time in lab
						Intensity of instructor guidance
There is application of knowledge and/or content in lab						
Tutorials						

NOTE: These are only general indicators to help the Curriculum Committee determine method of delivery.

* See other side for definitions
MAR:lw 8/22/96

* **Carnegie Unit Definition:** One credit hour of community college work is approximately three hours of recitation, study, or laboratory work per week throughout a term of 16 weeks. Where a term is more or less than 16 weeks, more or less than one credit hour shall be allowed in the same ratio that the length of the term is to 16 weeks. (Title 5: 55002.5)

Composition course word count:

A composition course two or more levels below English 1A** requires a minimum of 3,000 words

A composition course one level below English 1A** requires a minimum of 3,500 to 5,000 words

A composition course equal to English 1A** requires a minimum of 5,000 to 10,000 words

A composition course any level above English 1A** requires a minimum of 10,000 words

** English 1A, as quoted in Title 5, is equivalent to Grossmont College's English 110

MAR:lw 8-22-96

May 19, 1997

Draft

Whereas in the fall of 1996 both Cuyamaca and Grossmont College Senates passed similar resolutions declaring that WSCH/FTE productivity goals is a standard or policy that affects student success and therefore is an academic and professional matter as defined in Section 53200, (c) of the Title 5 California Code of Regulations, and

Whereas Board Policy provides for mutual agreement with the academic senates, as defined in Section 53203 of the Title 5 California Code of Regulations, and

Whereas section 53203 of the Title 5 California Code of Regulations further states that "when a board elects to provide for mutual agreement and an agreement has not been reached, existing policy shall remain in effect unless such policy exposes the district to legal liability or fiscal hardship....in cases...when legal liability or fiscal hardship requires existing policy to be changed the board may act, after a good faith effort to reach agreement, only for compelling legal fiscal, or organizational reasons."

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Grossmont College supports the United Faculty position that the establishment of the WSCH/FTE operating levels is an academic matter and thus falls within the purview of the Academic Senates and not the United Faculty.

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate remind the district of this legal obligation to reach mutual agreement with the Academic Senates, not United Faculty on WSCH/FTE goals, as agreed upon by the designated committees on both campuses, and if agreement cannot be reached, existing goals will remain in effect unless such policy exposes the district to legal liability or fiscal hardship, and

Be it further resolved that if the governing board determines that there is liability or fiscal hardship, it documents the evidence in written correspondence directed to the Academic Senates of Grossmont and Cuyamaca Colleges.