

Part-Time Issues Committee
of the Grossmont College Academic Senate

Possible Resolutions to be presented in 2007-2008:

-Renew call for paid Office Hours

In 2005, a Resolution was adopted by the Grossmont Senate calling for Paid Office Hours for adjunct faculty. Yet, nothing has come of this. A new Resolution would seek to resurrect the issue for discussion and reaffirm support.

-Expand Part-Time Participation in Academic Senate

In Fall 2006, Grossmont Faculty overwhelmingly approved adding a Part-Time Officer to the Senate Executive Committee. This Resolution would go further and include the Southwestern/Mira Costa College Senate models in which one (1) Part-Time Senator from each Division is added to the Senate body. These Part-Time Division Reps are also paid a monthly stipend for their work.

- Support Statewide Call for Parity

Many ranking officials in the California State Academic Senate have called for "parity" for adjunct faculty. Right now, in the GCCCD, Part-Timers are only paid 39% *pro rata* of the full-time average (PT= \$27K; FT= 69K/yr).

-Encourage Part-Time Participation in all (monthly) Department Meetings

Although most Departments do not specifically prohibit Adjuncts from attending monthly meetings, many Departments do not encourage it. This Resolution would encourage all Departments to incorporate Part-Timers participation in all Department functions.

-Hiring Committee Reform

Adjunct faculty have regularly participated in GCCCD hiring committees. However, many Depts are under the assumption that only tenured faculty can participate in Hiring Committees. Given that a discussion is now ongoing on changing hiring committee practices, it seems timely to introduce a Resolution that reminds faculty that Adjuncts have participated in hiring, can participate, and are participating in select Depts.

-Hiring Reform

All too often, Grossmont Part-Timers are passed by when new Full-Time positions are filled. There is nothing more demoralizing than to devote years to a campus just to watch while a new Full-Timer is recruited from outside the campus pool of Part-Time Faculty. This Resolution would call for prior, inner-District contributions by GCCCD Adjuncts to be recognized and considered when those Adjuncts face hiring committees for full-time positions.

November 30, 2007

Chris,

I know it is a little late for this, but I wanted to share with you and other colleagues a survey I conducted. I was concerned that while we had surveyed faculty in preparation for our discussion of the "Plus/Minus" issue, no one had looked at student attitudes. Consequently, I did a quick survey of four sections of my Introductory Sociology classes. There are obvious problems with the sample: it is late in the semester, the respondents are Sociology students, and even worse, they are sociology students who have been able to put up with me for an entire semester. In spite of this, I think the data is worth discussing. I had one hundred and forty-nine respondents, and I had a 100% response rate among those students who showed up for class Wednesday Nov. 28th and Thursday Nov. 29th. I have included copies of the tables I generated from this survey below, but I will give a narrative description of the findings for those who are data adverse (if anyone is interested, I am happy to make the raw data available in an SPSS file).

I asked four questions about respondents' attitudes toward the "Plus/Minus" proposal. First, after giving them a brief description of the proposal, I asked: "Given what you know about this proposal, do you oppose or support changing to a plus/minus grading system" (see Table One). The second question asked: "Assume there are two sections of the same class at identical times, but one instructor uses a plus/minus grading system, and the other instructor uses the traditional five point grading system. Which class would you choose?" (see Table Two). The third question was phrased similarly to the second, but asked if their feelings would affect a choice between attending two similar community colleges where one offered the Plus/Minus option and the other one did not (See Table Three). The last question was an open ended question that asked them if they had any specific worries about a plus/minus system (data NOT presented).

The findings indicate that more students oppose than support the change, though if those who were "neutral/undecided" are combined with those who support the proposal (admittedly a questionable act) then a little over half are not opposed to the change. The same applies to the questions about instructors and colleges.

The fact that there is a plurality of students who oppose the change is worth taking seriously. Some of this is probably fear of the unknown (better the devil you know than the devil you don't know), but most of it seems to be a concern about losing GPA. In the open ended question over 60% of students indicated some concern about this decrease. The next two concerns were that there could be some problem in transferring as a result of this change (25%), and that it would give too much power to teachers (a little less than 5%).

There is some evidence in this data that we could get an increased tendency toward instructor "shopping" (looking of instructors who don't use +/-); and maybe some possibility of abandoning Grossmont for other Community Colleges that don't use +/- . I admit that the data probably exaggerate these last two possibilities: no matter what they say on a questionnaire, most students choose instructors and community colleges because of convenience.

More disturbing is another fact. There is a strong association between GPA and opposition to the change (see Tables Four and Five). Our A students seem to be those most opposed to the change: over 60 per cent of them oppose plus/minus, while less than thirty per cent of C students feel likewise. Given the fact that an A+ is still only a 4.0, A students have the biggest down side risk. As one A student said in the open-ended question: "As a mostly A student, my concern is that if I were to earn a 93% in a class I wouldn't receive the 4.0 credit, and would instead receive a 3.7, overall lowering my GPA...I think that it is slightly unfair due to the fact there is no effect on lower scores: a B+ receives a higher grade point than a B, however, an A+ receives the same points as a regular A. I'm not sure how this would effect students who don't earn good grades, but as an A student I feel that it would be a negative, and unfair change."

I know that this kind of evidence should not stop us from doing what we believe is academically correct, but it should at least make us consider the down side for students.

Gregg Robinson, Ph.D.

P.S. I "replied all" to your message, but if this doesn't go out to other faculty, could you forward it to them? Thanks.

G.

Table One: Would Support or Oppose +/-

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Oppose +/-	18	12.1	12.2	12.2
	Oppose +/-	49	32.9	33.3	45.6
	Support +/-	41	27.5	27.9	73.5
	Strongly Support +/-	12	8.1	8.2	81.6
	Neutral/Don't Know	27	18.1	18.4	100.0
	Total	147	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.3		
Total		149	100.0		

Table Two: Would prefer instructor with plus/minus

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Definetly NOT choose +/- Instructor	20	13.4	13.8	13.8
	Probably NOT choose +/- Instructor	52	34.9	35.9	49.7
	Probably choose +/- Instructor	30	20.1	20.7	70.3
	Definetly choose +/- Instructor	10	6.7	6.9	77.2
	Neutral/Don't Know	33	22.1	22.8	100.0
	Total	145	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.7		
Total		149	100.0		

Table Three: Would prefer college with plus/minus

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Definetly NOT choose +/- College	20	13.4	13.6	13.6
	Probably NOT choose +/- College	52	34.9	35.4	49.0
	Probably choose +/- College	30	20.1	20.4	69.4
	Definetly choose +/- College	6	4.0	4.1	73.5
	Neutral/Don't Know	39	26.2	26.5	100.0
	Total	147	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.3		
Total		149	100.0		

Table Four: Support/Oppose Plus/Minus by GPA

Feelings About Plus/Minus	GPA Average			
	A	B	C	D
Strongly Oppose +/-	14.3%	18.2%	.0%	11.1%
Oppose +/-	45.7%	30.9%	28.1%	27.8%
Support +/-	22.9%	32.7%	28.1%	27.8%
Strongly Support +/-	8.6%	7.3%	12.5%	.0%
Neutral/Don't Know	8.6%	10.9%	31.3%	33.3%

Table Five: Measures for Association Between Support/Oppose Plus/Minus by GPA

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error(a)	Approx. T(b)	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-.160	.065	-2.434	.015
	Spearman Correlation	-.216	.087	-2.441	.016(c)
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.241	.086	-2.746	.007(c)
N of Valid Cases		124			

a Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c Based on normal approximation.

Revised

**TECHNOLOGY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE (TTLC)
A COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

CHARGE:

This committee will

- Assess and recommend the use of appropriate educational technology for a more effective teaching and learning environment at Grossmont College.
- Participate in developing, maintaining and implementing the college educational technology plan.
- Participate in developing recommendations for the direction of technology for teaching and learning
- By means of a subcommittee on distance education, direct and implement the goals of the Academic Senate in the area of online education.

MEETING SCHEDULE:

This may be adjusted as necessary to fit faculty schedules. For the 2007-2008 academic year the meeting will be on the 4th Monday of the month from 11am to 12:20am.

CHAIR:

The TTLC will vote for a faculty chair and send that person's name to the Academic Senate for ratification. The designee need not be a current faculty representative to the TTLC. The chair will serve for two academic years.

COMPOSITION:

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

- Faculty Chair (1)
- Distance Education Coordinator (1)
- Business & Professional Studies Division (2)
- Communication and Fine Arts Division (2)
- Humanities and Social/Behavioral Sciences Division (2)
- Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Exercise Science and Wellness Division (2)
- Learning and Technology Resources Division (1)
- Counseling department (1)
- Part-time faculty (1)
- DSPS faculty (1)
- CATL Coordinator (faculty) (1)

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE FOLLOWING AREAS

- Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee (1)
- Dean of Learning and Technology Resources Division or designee (1)
- Dean from one of the 4 academic divisions (1)
- Information Systems (1)
- Technology support (1)
- ASGC (1)

ADOPTED:

12/3/2007

REVISED:

NOTES:

All faculty representatives will be voting members.

All meetings are open for all interested persons to attend and participate, but only the faculty members of the committee may vote.

SUPPORT STAFF:

A support staff is necessary and will be identified as required. During the 2007 – 2008 academic year this is the Administrative Secretary from the Learning and Technology Resources Division.

NB: This committee is a reorganization of the Instructional Computing Committee and will replace it in Spring 2008

**Academic Senate Committee Appointments
2007-08**

Program Review:

Claudia Flores

Part-time Issues:

Debora Justeson

Kathryn Herbst-Damm

Allen Chu

Carla Sotelo

Curriculum Committee:

Michelle Blackman (Fall 2007 semester only)

Scholarship Committee:

Michele Perchez

Planning and Budget Council:

Adelle Schmidt

Mary Rider (for Patty Morrison)

Enrollment Strategies Committee:

Allison Shearer

Beth Duggan

Christi Vicino

Michael Perez

Student Grievances:

Jim Papageorge

Victoria Howitt

Marion deKoning

Sonia Gaiane