Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 23, 2010 (12:30-1:30 pm, PE Conference Room)

Members present: Steven Balassi, Stephanie Burns, Shawna Bynum, Dianna Chiabotti, Susan Engle, Stephanie Grohs, Ann Gross, Julie Hall, Rob Miller, Rebecca Scott, Erik Shearer, and Nadine Wade-Gravett.

Member absent: Michelle Hobbs and Walter Unti.

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order at 12:36 p.m.

2. **Adoption of the Agenda** -msp

3. **Approval of Minutes from 3/2/10** -msp

4. **Public Comment** -none

5. **Discussion/Action Items**

   5.1 **Ad-hoc Curriculum Report**
   Committee reviewed Ad-hoc report. Curriculum Committee Chair highlighted the important aspects. After much discussion, the Executive Committee decided to recommend the following:

   - COR should be 99% accurate before CC submission.
   - Process for submission would be as followed: Faculty Author – Division Chair/Dean – Faculty Review Team – back to Faculty Author if changes are needed – back to Faculty Review Team – Articulation – Curriculum Committee.

   - Discussion focused on the role and responsibilities of the Division Chair. Faculty, not the Division Chairs, are responsible for content. It is recommended that checklist be developed for Division Chairs to check off technical issues.

   - Distance Ed issue has been voiced by VP Sue Nelson. During the development process, the faculty may consult with the DE Coordinator. Faculty Review Team will review Distance Ed requirements.

   - Faculty Authors are not required to attend CC meetings for non-substantive revisions. Questions should be asked/answered via email.

   - Faculty will be required to attend or send a representative for the following changes:
1) Changes to prerequisites
2) Addition of Distance Ed
3) Changes to Unit/Hours
4) Major changes to curriculum
5) Multi Cultural/Gender Studies class
6) New Courses or Programs

C. Remove SLO, Tech Editor, Distance Ed from the process.

-As per 1725, the voting members of the Curriculum Committee shall be Articulation Officer (if faculty), Instruction area representatives (SME, COUN, LADS, Arts and Humanities, SOSC, CTE Business, Librarians, HEOC, PE/Athletics. Non voting members shall include Division Chairs, Deans, Credit Schedule Developer, Student Representative.

5.2 McPherson Awards
Due to the anticipation retirements, the Academic Senate cannot contribute to the luncheon.

5.3 Enrollment Management Report
Enrollment Management Teams is exploring options for students who do not pay at the time of registration. Currently a feature in Web Advisor exists that can drop a student who has not paid within 5 days. After discussion, it was recommended that a shorter timeline be developed for students who do not pay. Financial Aid students will be flagged by the system and not dropped. The recommendation will be forward to the Enrollment Management team.

6. **Items for Next Meeting**

6.1 Next Meeting Date: April 6, 2010

6.2 Next Meeting Topics: Non-Smoking Policy, Restriction of NE College Property, and Articulation Policy.

7. **Adjournment** 1:36 p.m.
Members present: Steven Balassi, Stephanie Burns, Shawna Bynum, Susan Engle, Stephanie Grohs, Ann Gross, Julie Hall, Rob Miller, Rebecca Scott, Erik Shearer, and Nadine Wade-Gravett.

Members absent: Dianna Chiabotti, Michelle Hobbs and Walter Unti.

1. **Welcome**  
   President S.Bynum called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

2. **Adoption of Agenda**  
   move 5.4 to Consent Agenda  
   move 7.2.2 to before 7.1  
   msp

3. **Approval of Minutes from 2-2-09**  
   5.9 correction – to read “Senate Executive Committee has concerns that the current process and language lack standards and criteria for evaluation.”  
   msp

4. **Public Comment** -none

5. **Action/Discussion Items**

   5.1 **Bylaws Revision**  
   The following changes were made and approved – msp
   
   -3 Year Committee Term  
   With an option to add a second term
   
   -Floating Committee Size  
   Academic Standards & Practices 4-5  
   Faculty Standards & Practices 4-5  
   Learning Outcomes 4-6  
   Professional Development 4-5  
   Social 4-5  
   Student Standards & Practices 4-5  
   Staff Development 1-2
-BSI Committee membership will be five to six faculty and a Co-Chair from the Office of Instruction.

-Chairs will be Tenured Faculty unless approved by the Executive Committee.

5.2 Articulation Policy – tabled

5.3 Animal Policy
Changes on clothing restrictions for service animals and questions about legal accommodations for emotional issues. S.Bynum will take recommended changes back to cabinet.

5.4 Item moved to Consent Item 6.5.

5.5 Flex Day Topics 2010/2011
Based on Zoomerange results the flex day will follow the Conference Model with a menu of choices. PDC will survey to develop topics.

5.6 Restrictions on Development of NE College Property
Discussion regarding restrictions and language to be continued.

5.7 Tenure Timelines
PDC has approved the timeline changes.

5.8 Transfer Degree – tabled

6. Consent Items - msp

6.1 Emeritus Status for Sable Howard-Hughes

6.2 GE Philosophy

6.3 Wayne Fortier Replaces Kate Benscoter on Academic Standards & Practices

6.4 Kate Benscoter Replaces Wayne Fortier on Facilities Planning

6.5 BOT Policy on Equivalency

7. Reports

7.1 Officers Reports

7.1.1 President – Shawna Bynum
no report

7.1.2 1st Vice Pres. – Erik Shearer
No report
7.1.3 2nd Vice Pres. /FCC Report – Rebecca Scott
Tenure recommendations are proposed for the following: Jessica Amato, Steve Ball, Michael Derby, Aaron DiFranco, Wayne Fortier, Donna Geiger, Alejandro Guerrero, Michelle Hobbs, Tia Madison, Angela Moore, Janet Stickmon, and Lisa Yanover.

7.1.4 Secretary – Nadine Wade-Gravett
No report

7.1.5 Treasurer – Julie Hall
Current balance is $1922.41.

7.2 Standing Committee Chair Reports

7.2.1 Academic Standards & Practices – Stephanie Grohs
No report

7.2.2 Curriculum – Steven Balassi
- Category due date for revisions is March 17th
- GE – Subcommittee is examining for corrections
- Definition of AA/AS – all proposals will go to the Academic Standards and Curriculum to make sure that they are correctly categorized.

7.2.3 Faculty Standards & Practices – Ann Gross
Committee is working on the Ethics Policy for April Agenda and the Hiring Policy for the May agenda.

7.2.4 Learning Outcomes Assessment – Erik Shearer
No report

7.2.5 Professional Development – Rebecca Scott
Some discussion about changing the title of the Teaching and Learning Center to make it more inclusive.

7.2.6 Social Committee – Susan Engle
No report

7.2.7 Student Standards & Practices – Rob Miller
No report

7.3 Shared Governance Committee Chair Reports

7.3.1 Budget – Walter Unti
No report

7.3.2 Planning – Stephanie Burns
No report
8 Items for Next Meeting

8.1 Spring meeting dates: April 6, 2010
                           May 4, 2010

8.2 Next meeting topics

9 Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 1:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Nadine Wade-Gravett, Academic Senate Secretary

2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway, Napa, CA 94558
(707) 259-6068 (707) 253-3018 FAX
This ad hoc committee was asked to research and discuss the below questions and submit findings and recommendations to the Executive Committee via the AS President. After many emails and interviews the ad hoc committee offers the following summary of responses:

I. Curriculum Process:

A. Does our current curriculum submission, review, and approval process adequately support and maintain Academic Senate and faculty purview over curriculum as outlined in AB 1725, Title 5, ACCJC standards (Standard II.A.2.a.) and best practice recommendations from the ASCCC? If not, how should it be revised?

Ad hoc committee response:

1. The process could be made more efficient if the non-substantive curriculum actions could be handled in the “consent” mode. Revisions made in the consent mode may not have to wait a full year to be implemented; i.e. a Form D. (Articulation Officer has data)
2. There appears to be an unnecessary number of approval agents. Steps such as the Distance Education Coordinator, SLO’s, and Librarian may be unneeded.
3. Don’t require course authors to be present for revisions.
4. COR review and official feedback should be documented and shared in a public forum. Sidebar conversations should be prohibited. (The committee questions the viability and intent of this)
5. Course authors should be encouraged, as part of the course development process, to conduct research related to their course with other colleges and with colleagues on campus.
6. The process should encourage the contribution of adjunct faculty when their expertise and effort will assist the department/division. This will help one-person programs accomplish curriculum revision in a more timely and appropriate manner. An adjunct faculty should have the capacity to be identified as the lead faculty in curriculum development/revision with the approval/consent of the department full-time faculty and the division chair/dean.
7. The committee responsible for approving the Form E (courses for multi-cultural and gender studies requirement) should also be charged with reviewing all courses that focus on one or more particular ethnicities, gender, sexual orientation, religion, nationality, or disability. Ideally this committee should include faculty who have received advanced training in the area of diversity. (The ad hoc committee questions the need and justification for this)
8. The CC should receive annual training/review of college mission, vision, and values with emphasis on the college’s SLOs related to diversity. (the ad hoc committee questions the need for this)
9. Yes, the process works well. It helps to have experts in specific areas look at specific parts of the COR. The more eyes the better. Even though the process seems long, the CORs are of higher quality than in the past when the process was shorter.

B. Should Deans and Division Chairs have the ability to edit sections of proposal? If so, what sections, by what mechanism, and with what senate or administrative oversight?

Ad hoc committee response:

1. There seems to be a consensus that curriculum committee proposals should be 99% accurate and complete when they are submitted to the Curriculum Committee. It should be
up to the program/division as to what edits will occur before the submission of proposals, but the course authors should have the primary authority and responsibility.

2. As a college community we should respect the subject matter expertise of our course authors, regardless of their specific institutional role.

3. Deans/Division Chairs should be working with course authors during initial stages of proposals and it is their job to give feedback at stage 3. They should be able to do technical edits at this time. The proposals should not have to come back to the Dean/Division chairs for approval at every stage as they do now. The Deans/Division chairs only need to be kept aware of the progress of a proposal as it goes through the different stages of the curriculum review process.

4. Make Deans/ Division Chairs accountable for thorough review at or prior to stage 3.

5. The course author should be regarded as the subject matter expert for course content and instructional methodologies. The CC should not question the content beyond satisfying a curiosity or seeking clarification.

6. Deans and Division Chairs should have the ability to edit the COR, but only as long as they are doing so in collaboration with the discipline faculty/author.

C. Current NVC AS practices require Division Chairs and Deans to secure division approval of curriculum proposals. Should this be revised to require only department approval?

*Ad hoc committee response:*

1. An open and informed curriculum development assures inclusivity of interests, develops an understanding of how the curriculum changes affect the larger community, and defines what resources may be needed. Although these objectives may be different for some programs in a division, for most divisions the nomenclature, perspectives, and interests are so similar that division approval seems reasonable. Individual faculty members will sometimes opt out by not participating, but the process allows the opportunity for those who are willing to make the effort.

2. Yes, it should only have to go to the department. Leave it up to the Division hair/dean to tell the other affected departments.

3. The timeline does not allow for Division chairs/deans to present the new courses/revisions to the division or individual departments before they are due to the Curriculum Committee.

II. Curriculum Committee Structure:

A. What Curriculum Committee membership structure will best ensure Academic Senate and faculty purview over curriculum, mirror best-practice recommendations from the ASCCC, and maintain a collaborative process between administration and the AS?

*Ad hoc committee response:*

1. See B below

B. What changes can be made to either the curriculum process or committee structure to better support faculty in the creation and revision of curriculum?

*Ad hoc committee response:*
1. This response targets both A and B under Curriculum Committee Structure. There are several models that have been described by the responses:
   A. Keep the committee structure as it is.
   B. Reduce the number of members to include only faculty.
   C. Let the divisions decide on which persons they want to represent them on the Curriculum Committee. For instance, the members can be two faculty members, a faculty member and a division chair, or a faculty member and a division dean.
   D. The committee should be composed of nine faculty members, two co-chairs (faculty and administrator), the articulation officer, one dean/division chair, and the Distance Ed. coordinator. Remove the SLO coordinator and Learning Resource representative from the committee. Eliminate tech review position and give responsibility to course authors and faculty review teams. (Distance ed. Coordinator participation should be eventually phased out)

2. As stated in I. A above, there are some members who are on the committee because of a function that could be completed outside of the Curriculum Committee process.

3. With the increasing commitments to faculty for workload outside the classroom, it may be possible to reduce the number of persons on the Curriculum Committee and make them available for other important senate work. Some of the interviewees felt that this would be a desirable goal, and the decrease in committee membership would not interfere with the Committee’s ability to do their work.

III. Division Chair / Dean Roles

A. Does the current role for Division Chairs and Deans as listed in the 2009 CC Handbook adequately support their administrative responsibilities to curriculum?

   **Ad hoc committee response:**

   1. If the structure were to change the exact language would need to reflect that change.
   2. The role of the division chair/dean is critical in providing administrative accountability for the process. Holding department/division meetings regarding curriculum development/revision, checking to make sure that proposals are accurate and complete before submission, and keeping to the Curriculum Committee timelines are all tasks that need to be assigned to specific persons. Attending the Curriculum Committee meetings may or may not be part of the job description depending upon senate action after the full review process.

   3. Yes, the Division chairs/deans need to be present at curriculum committee meetings to inform faculty and the CC about curriculum being discussed in other divisions. It does not make sense for Division chairs/deans for have another outside meeting to discuss curriculum and then send that information to the CC.

B. If not, how should the stated roles and responsibilities as defined by the AS be revised to support their responsibilities? Should the AS recommend revisions to their curriculum responsibilities outlined in the Division Chair Handbook to the Vice President of Instruction?

   **Ad hoc committee response:**

   1. The answers to the questions listed in III B will depend upon the decisions about any reorganization of the Curriculum Committee. As stated above, there are arguments for either keeping the process as it is, or for modifying the process. Any modification would require changes to the Division Chair Handbook as well as the Curriculum Committee Handbook.
2. Again, the senate may consider any of the options above in II B 1. The changes, if approved, would trigger revisions to the aforementioned documents.

I would like to thank Bonnie Moore, Diana Chiabotti, Greg Miraglia, and Michael Conroy for their efforts in developing this report. I would also like to thank all members of the college community who contributed their ideas. I hope that the executive committee can use this information for further dialog and action.
Suggested CC Changes

- COR’s should be 99% accurate before CC submission.
- Faculty authors are not required to attend CC meetings for revisions, only new courses/programs. Questions should be asked/answered beforehand via email.
- Remove SLO, Tech Editor, and Distance Education levels which will reduce the number of times a COR is sent back to faculty for edits.