

TAFT COLLEGE SENATE COUNCIL

MINUTES  
TUESDAY,  
JANUARY 12, 2021  
9:10AM TO  
10:00AM  
Via ZOOM

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/95316737125?pwd=Q2x1a3k1dTljazlWQk5RREZCVDR3Zz09>

646617

*Roll call voting is required in meetings conducted through Zoom.*

*Zoom etiquette for this meeting: Raise hand and wait for acknowledgement to avoid talking over others.*

*State your name when making motions and seconds as those speaking may not be seen on all attendees monitors. Remember this is a public forum meeting under the Brown Act.*

Call to Order 9:11 am

Attendees:

**Abbott, A.**

**Altenhofel, J**

**Devine, B**

**Dyer, G**

**Eveland, S.**

**Golling, G.**

**Jacobi, V.**

**Jiles, M.**

**Kulzer-Reyes, K**

**Travis, L.**

**Public Commentary on Action Items**

No members of the public are present.

Approval of the Minutes – December minutes are tabled for Kulzer to clean up.

1. Approval December 16, 2020 Minutes (3 minutes) ACTION

**Informational Items:**

2. NONE DISCUSSION

Updates:

3. NONE

**Old Business: Assignment of Responsibility for Development and/or Recommendation to Senate of the Whole for Action**

4. Recommendation: Annual Academic Senate Committee Evaluation Process  
ACTION

We were looking at the form for Governance Council's form, but discussed creating our own form. Suggestion made that each committee look at their own processes. No action taken. Discussion about the necessity of the process.

Questions about the documentation of the committee process work. Already part of the charter and work. The minutes from each subcommittee's meetings are published on the TC website. If we return to the minutes, we can see what work has been completed and look at how a standing agenda item could help. When reviewing the charter, the annual review of effectiveness should happen. Recommendations to evaluate the prior year on the charter review date.

Process should include committees will evaluate the prior year's work in the Goals within charters, but some committees have a need for strategic planning.

Past years effectiveness has been an expectation, but the documentation process has not been consistent.

Some committees do not do this currently. Documenting the process is the goal. The AS of the Whole has stated that subcommittees do this.

Dyer mentioned that evaluation for ongoing improvement was

Chairs agreed to aspirational goals, and these goals brought information to the committee.

The Gov. Council form includes monitoring from outside groups.

Could be integrated in the charter review process. Monitoring the charter and evaluating the subcommittee's work is a way to continue to do this.

Curious about the need for this. Can we make a motion to direct each subcommittees to

Add evaluation of effectiveness in the review of the committee's charter.

There is no external pressure to create this, but the concern is consistency. Goal is to document processes and procedures for future committee members.

If it were the will of the Academic Senate of the Whole to perform this task, we should amend the ASW bylaws to make it clear what the goals and purpose are. Many of the committees are looking at effectiveness with the charter review. This would be an easy way to monitor effectiveness.

Charter

5. AP 7211 – Faculty Service Areas, Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalencies  
ACTION

Standards

Once we set parameters, the taskforce's work on this will be included in the discussion.

Geoffrey Dyer shared backstory: Recommendation that the senate have an equivalence committee because of contractual issues. That is why that 7211 establishes that faculty on screening committees. There is a different group of faculty on each committee. Assigning equivalence because of the league template for a subcommittee, but TC's AS of the Whole didn't have interest in creating this for contractual reasons, mainly being required to meet in the

summer.

Single course equivalency is not legally allowed. Equivalency updates are problematic because the state hasn't looked at minimum qualifications. Hiring pools are impacted and faculty diversification can be negatively impacted by not using equivalence procedures effectively and equitably. The ASCCC paper should be available soon.

There are also distinctions for disciplines that require a master's degree and those in the CTE area. In all areas, the equivalency of general education knowledge need to be included. It is problematic that we cannot show documented consistency.

All applicants who fill out the equivalency forms are assumed to have equivalency. Then the hiring committee

Screening committee determines the initial equivalency.

Only applicants who meet equivalency should be offered an interview based on our AP 7211.

The administrator and division chair are to look at the screening committee's work. Per the AP, we should be addressing the current practice.

Academic Senate of the Whole modified the process, and now the AP is in conflict with the next revision. If someone applies, the assumption is that they meet equivalency. Equivalency is prevalent in CTE hiring and we need to clarify the process.

The reason this has come forward is to eliminate bias. It could be used poorly, though. As a Senate we want consistency and equity. The documented process is needed to clean up our procedure.

Tabled

### **New Business: Assignment of Responsibility for Development and/or Recommendation to Senate of the Whole**

6. AP 3720 Computer and Network Use – ITC recommended revisions

ACTION

7. Professional Development/Training/Orientation for Committee Members

DISCUSSION

Discuss this in the next meeting.

### **Other Announcements**

**Adjournment** 10:02 am Abbott

Second: Jiles

Motion passed by unanimous Consent.