SANTA ANA COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE

1530 W. 17th St.
Santa Ana, CA 92706
(714) 564-6831
AcademicSenate@sac.edu

SANTA ANA COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT
Santa Ana College inspires, transforms, and empowers a diverse community of learners.

Academic Senate
Business Meeting Minutes

Date: **Tuesday, September 8th, 2020**
Time: **1:30-3:30pm**
Location: **Zoom Webinar Location**

Attendees	User Email	Attendees	User email
Adriana Ramirez		Kelvin Leeds (he/him/his) (Kelvin Leeds)	leeds_kelvin@sac.edu
Alejandro Moreno	moreno_alejandro@sac.edu	Larisa iPhone	
Ali Kowsari	kowsari_ali@sac.edu	Leo Pastrana	pastrana_leo@sac.edu
Amberly Chamberlain	chamberlain_amberly@sac.edu	Luis Pedroza	pedroza_luis@sac.edu
Andrew Barrios	barrios_andrew@sac.edu	Maria "Lupe" Estrada	
Annette Bui	bui_annette@sac.edu	Maria Aguilar Beltran (She/Her)	beltran_maria@sac.edu
ASL Interpreter: Stephanie Webb	stephanie@yourvolution.com	Martha Guerrero-Phlaum	guerrero_martha@sac.edu
Beatriz Villa	villa_beatriz@sac.edu	Michael Taylor's iPhone (2)	
Brewster Swanlund	bswanlund@fullerton.edu	Michelle Vasquez	
Brian Sos*		Molly Colunga	
Chantal Lamourelle	lamourelle_chantal@sac.edu	Quynh Mayer	mayer_quynh@sac.edu
Cherylee Kushida	kushida_cherylee@sac.edu	Randy Scott	scott_randy@sccollege.edu
conorhiggins		Rebecca Ortiz	ortiz_rebecca@sac.edu
Dawn McKenna-Sallade	mckenna_dawn@sac.edu	Reyna Cummings	cummings_reyna@sac.edu
Dawn McKenna-Sallade	mckenna_dawn@sac.edu	Reza Mirbeik(Mohammadreza Mirbeik Sabzevary) (Reza Mirbeik)	sabzevary_mohammadreza@sac.edu
Fernando Ortiz	ortiz_fernando@sac.edu	Rick Manzano	manzano_rick@sac.edu
Gabriel Shweiri	shweiri_gabriel@sac.edu	Roy Shahbazian	shahbazian_roy@sac.edu
Heather Arazi	arazi_heather@sac.edu	soriano_irene's iPad	
Janet Cruz-Teposte	cruz_janet@sac.edu	Stephanie	
Jarek Janio	janio_jarek@sac.edu	Stephanie Clark	clark_stephanie@sac.edu

10+1

(1) Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines; (2) Degree and certificate requirements; (3) Grading policies; (4) Educational program development; (5) Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success; (6) District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles; (7) Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports; (8) Policies for faculty professional development activities; (9) Processes for program review; (10) Processes for institutional planning and budget development; (11) Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate

Jennifer Meloni	meloni_jennifer@sac.edu	Steve Bautista	bautista_steve@sac.edu
Jim Isbell*	isbell_james@sccollege.edu	Suanne Oh	oh_suanne@sac.edu
Jodi Coffman	coffman_jodi@sac.edu	Susan Hoang	hoang_susan@sac.edu
Jorge Lopez		William Nguyen*	nguyen_william@sac.edu
Karissa Lovero	lovero_karissa@sac.edu	Your Volution	contact@yourvolution.com
		Zachary Diamond	diamond_zachary@sac.edu

Meeting Location: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96274327789

Agenda:

1. **Call to Order** – 1:32pm - Roy Shahbazian

2. **Approval of Additions or Corrections to Agenda**
   a. Approved unanimously.

3. **Approval of Additions or Corrections to 8/11 and Retreat Minutes**
   a. Retreat minutes – all in favor
   b. 8/11 minutes - all in favor – no objections

4. **Public Comments** (3 minute limit)
   a. Stephanie Clark – Starting this semester she is assigned to the Digital Media Department, she has also been assigned to lead the animation program. The office of Academic Affairs has asked that we rely on the recommendation of CIC and Senate to review the Digital Media proposal. She is concerned that she is 'reassigned' without the curriculum being addressed and it is creating confusion.
   b. Michael Taylor shared that he would like to hear from Senate on this decision-making process. He requested that the Digital Media proposal be sent out with the minutes.
   c. Stephanie Clark shared a general concern re:emails from faculty about confusion about Remote Instruction & Certification, she wanted to share for the good of the body that this is an issue.

5. **Discussion: Faculty Hiring Process**- Roy Shahbazian
   a. Discussion and presentation on data, rubric and forms
   b. Presented on faculty full-time hiring prioritization process.
   c. Declining revenue.
   d. Uncertainty of FON.
   e. Strategic year to hire due to possibly few available positions.
   f. FT Hiring Outlook
      1. 14 Positions defunded this year
      2. Current plan is to bring back 14 vacant faculty positions in 2021-22.

(1) Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines; (2) Degree and certificate requirements; (3) Grading policies; (4) Educational program development; (5) Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success; (6) District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles; (7) Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports; (8) Policies for faculty professional development activities; (9) Processes for program review; (10) Processes for institutional planning and budget development; (11) Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate

g. Faculty Diversification is a priority.

1. Hiring Request Form
2. Position Information
3. Narrative Metrics

h. Simplifying Metrics

1. Last year's spreadsheet

    1. 3 sheets
    2. 42 columns
    3. 8 metrics highlights

2. Proposed Spreadsheet

    1. 3 sheets
    2. 75 columns
    3. Focus on 3 primary metrics

3. Prioritization: Ranking
4. Each 2nd year senator typically ranks each request
5. Combine Senator's rankings to obtain an aggregate ranking
6. Typically there are 30 requests to rank

i. Ranking with a rubric.

1. Rubric will be more objective and transparent while allowing subjectivity.
2. Ranking alone, hard to memorize the characteristics of 20 requests to rank the next request during the prioritization meeting.
3. Rubric allows Senators to decide how important each criteria is and how to weight subjective factors.
4. Rubric could be less likely to result in ties.

j. Roy shared all details within his presentation file.

k. Ali has a question: When do you expect to hear that we can hire? Will we be going through the process hoping for the best? We will have to manage expectations, may not get pushback on certain critical positions. Advocacy will need to be done, we probably won't get a hard decision before we need to finish the work of prioritizing.

l. Rebecca Ortiz asked about the list from last year. What are the advantages or disadvantages of using this previous ranking? There are advantages to doing the work, we could save a lot of work relying on last year. Disadvantage is that those requests are what the administration lowered, those that were early got through the hiring freeze. Some things may have changed. Since we ran those reports, other retirements and separations won't be reflected in the work from last year. Arguments could be made that with these changes, hiring could be re-ranked. With the retirements, about a dozen more faculty will be leaving in December so not only in consideration are last year's retirements but quite possibly December retirements.

m. Maria Estrada would like to see the previously ranked positions.

n. Rebecca Ortiz is excited to announce she is a Senior Senator, and by not doing it we might be resigning to the process. There's a lot going on, so she doesn't think we are who we were and that incorporation of new information about what students and the country is experiencing should reflected in the process we are engaging in. It is highly important to engage ourselves in the idea of sensitivity to diversity in all aspects. As we become more skilled, we should evaluate these processes with new lenses and asking 'who should come on as faculty'. Dual Enrollment and Ethnic Studies is one area where this might change.

o. Luis Pedroza would like clarification of rubrics. Louis is asking if we are looking at two changes, the rubric vs the form?

   1. The rubric would be provided ahead of time to assist with the ranking and the form would allow for additional criteria and narrative. Louis suggested using the old list and applying the rubric to that list to see how it goes.

p. Stephanie Clark agrees with a rubric, could assist with streamlining the ranking and allow more time for compelling discussion rather than wading through data live in the meeting.

q. Jose Lopez is concerned that occasionally ranking does not leave room for discussion, even though it is supposed to be intermediary, it sometimes does not encourage further discussion.

r. Next steps:

   1. Decide whether to incorporate a rubric

   2. Approve updated request form

   3. Roy shared draft of form and the reasoning behind each data point.

   4. Qualitative and Other factors - such as Coordinator, etc..

   5. Noncredit is worried that their information will be forgotten. Need to include noncredit data in spreadsheet.

   6. Maria Aguilar Beltran asked about the section for diversity. Some issues around institutional planning could be entered in the Narrative area, the Sensitivity to Diversity is asking the department how they will be evaluating an applicant's sensitivity to diversity.

   7. Luis Pedroza likes that the 2nd Min. Qual is part of this to assist the department in identifying how to evaluate this. Roy shared that some departments choose not to emphasize this, but others might want to articulate their steps and what they have in mind.

   8. Jose Lopez, is this going to be weighed equally for ranking positions? Can decide in the future what priority or what weight each criteria has.

   9. Not sure we vote on items once presented. This will be up for Action in the next meeting.

10. Motion to approve the concept of a rubric, remaining decisions and content would be future discussion. Rebecca Ortiz made first motion, Luis Pedroza seconded.

    1. Luis would like to bring up two points of discussion, since this wasn't shared with the department.
    2. Using this rubric, is this defined with the prioritization committee.
    3. Zachary Diamond would like to bring the rubric back to their department.
    4. Rebecca reminded that a vote in favor of a rubric is not a value of the rubric. Defining the rubric means that we define the process, for instance figuring out what the qualitative points are to be presented in advance of constituents.
    5. Molly is wondering what an argument against a rubric. Roy shared that without a rubric a faculty member could have the maximum flexibility without having preconceived guidance.
    6. William is wondering what happens if we are grid-locked? If we don't have a rubric system in place we will have to use the forced ranking.
    7. Ali isn't against a rubric per se, he's wondering how quickly we can implement this. In conjunction with other factors we are considering? Is it possible to put it all in a rubric.
    8. Rebecca thinks it makes a statement that we as Academic Senate is prioritizing hiring and we have already adopted a rubric and this includes a component related to 2nd Min. Quals, Diversity and Sensitivity. If we get zero options but we show this, we send a message about forward movement.
    9. Andrew Barrios confirmed the rubric is for us in the next hiring cycle? Or future hiring cycles?

6. Vote: 11 Yes, 2 No, 11 Abstentions – Motion passed.

7. **Reports:**

    a. President – Roy Shahbazian

        1. Title 5 Changes State Chancellor's Emergency Authority
        2. Conduct in Board Meetings – Chair of the Board could ask public to leave board meeting
        3. CCC Student Senate Action Plan. From Studentsenateccc.org
            1. Curriculum changes.
            2. Peer Mentors and alliances.
            3. Classroom experience.
        4. ASCCC Anti-racism Resolution
        5. Spring Schedule is a major item. Faculty hiring and budget issues.

    b. Secretary/Treasurer – Stephanie Clark

    c. ASG – no report.

d. SCC – Randy Taylor

    1. Retreat was about budget issues.

    2. Sabbatical issues. Passed unanimously.

    3. Taskforce to look at our SCC constitution and bylaws.

    4. Priorities for 20-21 similar to SAC.

e. Curriculum – Brian Sos

    1. CE 2 year review – make sure everyone is aware of this.

f. Planning & Budget – William Nguyen

    1. 20-21 Budget

    2. SCFF trying to get funding through these metrics

g. SACTAC – Susan Hoang

h. Guided Pathways – Stephanie Clark

    1. Success Teams Launched

    2. Faculty Leads will be assisting with the Career Exploration Months

    3. Also, please be the messengers, Starfish is our new Early Alert system. We want to see 100% adoption by faculty. Please submit your Early Alerts next week.

i. Accreditation – Monica Zarske (emailed in writing)

    1. Standard teams are still working on gathering evidence and writing initial drafts of our Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER).

    2. Monica Z. has developed a rubric so that teams can begin to evaluate their work. Will be distributed to team leads soon.

    3. SAC and SCC met with district personnel to coordinate the work of Standard III which focuses on resources.

    4. Goal is to have a working 1st draft by end of fall 2020, editing in January, and then begin participatory governance approvals in spring 2021. ISER must be approved by BOT in July for August 2 submission to ACCJC.

    5. Faculty are still encouraged to participate and get involved; contact Monica Z. if you are interested in joining a Standard team.

    6. Thank you to all who are participating.

j. Outcomes/Assessment – Jarek Janio

    1. Fall 2020 Department Goals:

        1. All departments have SLO statements in CurriCUNET Meta as part of CORs

10+1
(1) Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines; (2) Degree and certificate requirements; (3) Grading policies; (4) Educational program development; (5) Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success; (6) District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles; (7) Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports; (8) Policies for faculty professional development activities; (9) Processes for program review; (10) Processes for institutional planning and budget development; (11) Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate

2. All departments have their SLO statements and methods of assessment articulated and imported into Nuventive.

3. All departments reporting SLO assessment data

2. 2020-2021 Outcomes and Assessment Committee Goals:

1. Resource development and faculty training

2. Nuventive, CurriCUNET and Canvas integration

3. Identification of Student Services Outcomes

4. SLO/PLO and ILO alignment

5. SLO statements and assessments

6. SLOs and Equity

7. Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption

k. Student Success & Equity – Maria Aguilar Beltran

1. Moved SS&E from Thursday to the 17th. Moving forward these will be on the 1st Thursday of the month. This is due to the USC Equity Alliance trainings, which we are participating in, this is a train the trainer model. Addressing pertinent issues related to equity.

l. Faculty Professional Development – Amberly Chamberlain

1. Faculty PD workshops for 6 weeks.

2. Cornerstone Training is coming, a new flex tracking system.

3. PD Canvas shell. Take a look, this includes all videos from PD week. Would appreciate if you attended convocation to review the convocation survey for feedback. Need people from Humanities or Athletics in PD workgroup.

8. **Announcements**

9. **Adjournment** – 3:32pm – Meeting adjourned.