TAFT COLLEGE SENATE COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, FEBRUARY 17, 2021 12:10PM TO 1:00PM
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.
Attendees:
Abbott, A.
Altenhofel, J
Devine, B
Dyer, G
Eveland, S.
Jacobi, V.
Jiles, M.
Kulzer-Reyes, K
Travis, L.

Call to Order 12:10 pm

Public Commentary on Action Items

Approval of the Minutes

Approval December 16, 2020 Minutes (3 minutes) ACTION
Approved by unanimous consent

Approval January 12, 2021 Minutes (3 minutes) ACTION
Approved by unanimous consent

Informational Items:
ASCCC 2021 Spring Plenary – Virtual, April 15-17 DISCUSSION

Discussion:
Sharyn will be attending. Vicki and Geoffrey are attending. Amar is as well.
If you want to attend, please send Sharyn an email with interest.
There are many events through ASCCC. Please take a look at the website. The Leadership Academy will
be held this summer.

Updates:
NONE
We formed a team to complete the DEI survey. Myisha, Salvador, Jennifer, Amar, have met twice and are working on the DEI Survey. Sharyn is working on a local senate visit on anti-racism through the ASCCC.

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

Committee Charter Reviews/Updates – Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

The ASC reviewed this charter, and chose to send the charter back to the SLOASC committee. The SLO coordinator believes the current version now meets

Severo contacted Jacobi about student services. Should the specific areas be mentioned, like Student Services? Devine suggested the Governance Council might be helpful in this. Altenhofel was not aware that the subcommittee was responsible for the current website. Please add the SLO Coordinator to the website responsibilities.

Questions about bulleted points:
Altenhofel asked about the SLO charter creation and the influence of the VPI. This is a faculty committee, not an administrator (Governance Council).
The processes are mutually agreed upon, but the SLOs are generated by the faculty.
Processes for tracking the aggregated data related to SLOs is by mutual consent. Altenhofel was informed by the VPI that she did not like the faculty’s SLOs, and she wants changes campus wide.
It is good to look at SLOs with a critical eye, but the administration does not have purvey in this.
Protecting academic freedom in the creation and assessment of SLOs.
Abbott requested clarification on rely primarily upon and mutually agreed upon in terms of this +1. This is an area of mutual agreement. This is enshrined in board policy.
The charter is not where job responsibilities are located.
Jiles mentioned SLOs coming up at tech review. VPI defended academic freedom in that context.
Eveland: Does anyone see anything that needs to be addressed before moving forward to the Academic Senate.
More questions and discussion about topics in the guidebook.
Questions about #4 in the charter. How does the SLO committee identify and improve the process?
We should consider inviting SLOASC to be a regular item on the senate agenda to help keep the campus wide conversation moving forward.
There has been a dramatic reduction in the level of exposure to SLOs and the process.

Motion: Altenhofel
Second: Dyer

AP 7211 – Faculty Service Areas, Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalencies

This keeps returning to attention. The version of 7211 that we originally had was created by G. Dyer. WE needed 7211 to exist. It works, but is not helping track and monitor (and ensure) that we use the same process and standards within divisions. There is also no demarcation line within the AP.
In CTE, this is more complicated as the fields have unique standards to meet any of the five standards available because equivalency when someone does not have an associate’s degree, but has all other areas of experience, we can use the AP in case of audit.
Abbott asked “minimum qualification” in the field, but the second minimum qualification related to equity is not addressed. It should be.
Jacobi mentioned that one way to resolve this could include certain committees can create a guidebook, so as things change, we can add to the guidebook. Allow those creating the guidebook to add the requirements.
Altenhofel thought we fixed this with the revised equivalency form. There are more notes and directions
that could be shared, but the task force was not given a copy to address these issues. The form is on the website. There is a process to get the editable version of documents to Dyer asked if the request for the document to Sarah Criss was of the League version of documents. Models of equivalency handbooks were shared by ASCCC at the local site visit. There was hesitation to create a minimum qualification committee. When the newest version is ready, it can go forward to the Senate of the Whole. For now the AP can be general, but we need a guidebook that covers the variety of areas, timestamped. Every recommendation statewide states that an equivalency committee is appropriate. The structural outlines go into the AP. Then the guidebook would have the specific information for the different areas. In the future, discuss the two minimum qualifications and how we ensure our curriculum and faculty address both MQs. Juana Rangel-Escobedo, Lori Travis, Mike Jiles, Becky Roth, and Jennifer Altenhofel are already serving as an ad hoc group working on AP 7211. Sharyn will forward materials related to the AP 7211 ad hoc group.

Motion: Altenhofel
Second: Dyer
Ayes:

Abbott, A.
Altenhofel, J
Devine, B
Dyer, G
Eveland, S.
Jacobi, V.
Jiles, M.
Kulzer-Reyes, K
Travis, L.

Motion passed unanimously.
Adjournment 1:10 pm