

Academic Senate Report April 2018 Board of Trustees meeting

The end of February and start of March, we saw the accreditation report go out which required an extra emergency meeting on March 8th in order to meet the tight timeline of this work. Since that time, the Academic Senate has been working on a number of issues.

1. A process for clarifying our academic pathways- the first suggested pillar of the guided pathways initiative
2. Following the changes in mandates regarding basic skills in math and English, AS has heard presentations from English and math faculty on acceleration of this curriculum and I can tell you that they are working hard on this. They have both developed a plan for phasing in these changes. We anticipate that these changes will affect the prerequisites of many other classes. There is some concern as the Math mandates will not be clear until the fall and, with the October curriculum deadline, we hope that administration will be supportive of this work especially in regard to curriculum deadlines and not delay the work another year.
3. The Academic Senate has begun a discussion on the staffing of high school dual enrollment—concerns have arisen because faculty have been asked to grant MQs to high school instructors. Faculty are being placed into these positions in two ways: placement of college faculty to teach high school students and placement of high school faculty to teach our college courses. Each presents its problems. The first requires more professional development for training to teach in a high school setting. The second requires further vetting. Granting of MQ's must be done by discipline faculty. This falls squarely under the purview of faculty and, as such, of the Academic Senate. Our MQ approval process is always linked to a hiring process. MQ's are the MINIMUM qualifications and are accompanied by further vetting in the form of the application process (with diversity statement), interview process, evaluation process, mentorship and right of assignment. Jon Knolle and I have met to discuss this and he is working on a process.
4. We were really excited about guided pathways and I am bringing to you copies of a resolution written by the Academic Senate last fall regarding guided pathways. I was initially really optimistic because of the response of the campus in regard to guided pathways. There has been much excitement about clarifying, accelerating, and revamping pathways. Faculty have been attending conferences, reading papers, and attending on-campus meetings and presentations. We have heard repeatedly that the development of GPs on campuses do not work until admin enlists the inclusion of faculty leadership- this concept is, after all, an academic matter. A GP committee lead by Jon Knolle had been meeting to discuss the implementation of GP's on our campus and to complete a grant proposal that the campus has now obtained. But, I can tell you that we have, as is now commonplace on our campus, found that it is a bumpy road.

In the spirit of GPs, two new and exciting pathways which provide incredible opportunity to our students-one from social sciences and one from the nursing program- have been put forward by faculty but both have run into road blocks and discouragement in the admin building.

Additionally, when the grant was written, we had anticipated that faculty would be included in the leadership. Just to be clear on the process for this.... the appointment of faculty to committees is vetted through the COC and the AS. Our admin has made a unilateral decision to appoint a single administrator to lead the GP initiative with no discussion in advisory groups or in the Senate and absolutely no inclusion of faculty in this leadership. It is clear to me that the communication between admin and our faculty on this campus has only deteriorated further.