Minutes
March 21, 2017
Board Room
1:00 p.m.


II. Call to Order: 1:05 p.m.

III. Approval of Minutes: March 7, 2017 approved with no corrections

III. President’s Report
A. Planning Retreat was well attended—thank you.
B. Distinguished Faculty Award—the committee finished reviewing applications; the announcement will be given at the next Senate meeting.
C. Written Committee Reports—PFC will be using written committee reports in the future; does Senate need written reports from committees who do not have representation at Senate meetings? A Senator suggested having VPs share the charge of gathering committee reports.
D. Drop and Census Dates—see Addendum D—please share with faculty in your division; Senate will discuss and possibly vote on this item at a future meeting. A Senator recommended adding this procedure to an official AP or some formal holding place. Senate president will send out a pros and cons list to Senators.
E. Election Results—first ever online Senate Executive Officer election; a committee of two Senators reviewed the results and presented the following:
   1. President: Michelle Bean
   2. 1st Vice President: Juana Mora
   3. 2nd Vice President: Jorge Huinquez
   4. Secretary: Doralì Pichardo-Diaz
   5. Parliamenterian: Shelly Spencer
   6. ASCCC Rep: Mike Dighera
F. FERPA—deans may have sent your division faculty reminders on what not to do with student information, such as not posting or passing a list of student names with ID#. 
IV. Unfinished Business:
A. Writing Best Practices—see Addendum A and B
   1. Executive Motion: Writing Consistency and Best Practices
      Whereas, the Academic Senate through AB1725 has purview over curriculum and student success issues, and
      Whereas, the Executive Committee has developed specific overarching and long-term goals and recommendations regarding writing assignments across all disciplines,
      Therefore, be it resolved that the Academic Senate should adopt such recommendations and urge the faculty to embrace them, and
      Be it resolved that the Academic Senate President urge the Administration to likewise embrace these recommendations and support the faculty to carry out the recommendations.
      Be it further resolved that the Executive Committee appoint a person to coordinate and spearhead these recommendations.
      2. Motion passed unanimously

B. Academic Rank—see Addendum C; please present the information to your divisions and the Senate will vote in a future meeting.

V. New Business:
A. Online Education Initiative—presentation postponed.

VI. Committee Reports
A. Academic Rank—no report.
B. Basic Skills—conferences coming up for tutors and coordinator; putting together a team to go to a workshop in Sacramento.
C. Bookstore—no report.
D. Curriculum—no report.
E. FLEX/Staff Development—apply for spring grants. Flex deadline is May 1. Professional Development Needs Assessment will be distributed soon; please participate and we will enter you into a drawing.
F. ITC—Strong Workforce will be establishing a Cyber Security Program. RHC will be applying to be designated as a Center for Academic Excellence in Cyber Defense—we would be #2 community college in the state.
G. SLOs—provided data for ACCJC report; about 95% of courses assessed—which is good; having trouble gathering Program level SLO data. TK20 bought out by a new company; we are setting up a system to roll out the new software when available—a proposal went to administration.
H. Student Equity—First Year Success Center and Student Equity is hosting Together We Dream in Board Room from 12 to 2 p.m. this Thursday. Info was sent in email to students and through RHC social media. Student Equity committee was invited to be part of an exploratory committee for formerly incarcerated students—see Juana if you are interested.
I. OEC—no report.
J. OER—a few faculty members from the OER committee are working toward planning for the implementation grant.
K. IEC—Planning Retreat went well.
L. Program Review—summaries were given at Planning Retreat.
M. Safety—AS President spoke with the new director, and he is on board with starting the Safety meetings soon.
N. MIS/Enterprise—no report.

VII. Announcements:
A. Need more participation in hiring committees.
B. More info coming for guest speakers from Anthropology department on transgender issues.
C. First Year Seminars being written for Avance were just approved with Chancellor’s Office.

VIII. Public Comment—none.

IX. Adjournment: 2:12 p.m.
Addendum A:

To: All Faculty
From: The Academic Senate
Date: February 2017
Re: Establishing Consistency in Writing Assignments Within and Across Disciplines

The Academic Senate is charged with overseeing matters relating to curriculum, prerequisites, and student success, among others. A key component relating to these areas involves written work prepared by students for our classes. Providing consistency within and across divisions and disciplines with respect to written assignments is an important goal for the Senate. Therefore, the following process is recommended.

Assigning Written Work

All Most classes should have written assignments, both those that are prepared in advance (such as course papers and homework) and those that are written in class (such as essay exams and in-class assignments).

Teaching Communication Competency

Beyond writing assignments, students should be encouraged to develop appropriate communication skills. How one communicates sends a powerful message, one that will affect educational and professional goals. Getting into good habits, even when using mobile devices, is important. Employers and professors rarely find formal writing inappropriate. However, one poorly-written email can mean the difference between getting a job and continuing to be unemployed. Professors should instruct students to communicate appropriately in all educational and professional contexts.

Developing Consistency

In order to ensure that students receive similar educational experiences within each discipline, between disciplines in each division, and across disciplines, several steps should be taken. First, discipline faculty should meet to discuss the types of written assignments that are generally expected in each class. These discussions should include general word count guidelines for both in-class and homework assignments. Once developed, the guidelines should be shared among all faculty within the discipline, especially part-time faculty who may not have had the opportunity to participate in the initial discussions about written assignments.

Representatives from each discipline should then meet with others in their divisions to establish consistency. In many instances, different disciplines within a division will share similar expectations with respect to the amount of written work required in a class and the types of assignments given. Anthropology and sociology, for example, are comparable in terms of pedagogy, and should probably have very similar expectations. Other disciplines within the Behavioral and Social Sciences would be the same as well. Other the other hand, there might be significant differences between writing assignments in business law and computer information technology classes, both within the Business division.

A campus-wide dialogue, facilitated by the Academic Senate should bring all divisions together to develop a consistent policy for papers. Each division should designate facilitators to represent faculty for this campus-wide discussion. A good time for this to occur would be on a Flex Day. Divisions with similar types of classes (Behavioral and Social Sciences and Counseling for example) should attempt to align their writing assignments. The results of this dialogue should be shared to all faculty.
Addendum B:
To: All Faculty
From: The Academic Senate
Date: February 2017
Re: Best Practices Recommendations for Writing Assignments

The Academic Senate is charged with overseeing matters relating to curriculum, prerequisites, and student success, among others. A key component relating to these areas involves written work prepared by students for our classes. Providing consistency across divisions and disciplines with respect to written assignments and ensuring appropriate student preparation to complete such work are important goals for the Senate. Therefore, the following recommendations have been developed as guidelines for the types of written work assigned by faculty.

Ensuring Preparation
Written work should only be assigned if it aligns with student preparation. For example, students learn how to write formal research papers (complete with formatting rules such as MLA) in English 101. Therefore, if this is not a pre-requisite for a class, faculty should follow one of a few practices when it comes to papers. The first would be to not assign a formal research paper. Another option would be to only grade students on the elements of the assignment for which pre-requisites are met. This would mean that students, for instance, would not be graded on how well they employ MLA format. A final option would be to spend enough time in class reviewing all the elements necessary to write such a paper, including how to do research, avoid plagiarism, and cite properly.

Preparing Students
No matter what types of written assignments are given, faculty should always provide appropriate information to students about what the expectations are. Even a seemingly simple in-class reflection on an issue recently discussed in lecture requires instructions. For example, students might need to be told whether sentences are required (as opposed to bullet points) and what the expected length should be. More elaborate assignments will require greater levels of instruction. These can include grading rubrics, sample papers, and others. One recommended practice for more significant writing assignments, especially term papers, would be to assign multiple drafts.

Addressing Plagiarism
Faculty should provide students with their policies regarding plagiarism. One type of plagiarism is intentional, where students submit work knowing that it is not their own, such as turning in a paper that was purchased or written by someone else. Unintentional plagiarism is different. This occurs when students do not know when references are required or how to reference material. If a class does not have the appropriate pre-requisites, students must be told either be given explicit training on how to avoid unintentional plagiarism or not be graded down because of it. Faculty must ensure that students understand what is required when using information from sources outside of the class material. Putting policies in the syllabus is recommended.

Ensuring Adequate Preparation
Faculty should adhere to the recommendations regarding preparation laid out in the Course Outlines of Record and understand the expected skill level of their students. Also, faculty should ensure that the course outlines reflect the reality of the courses and that the course outlines be kept up-to-date.
Academic Senate 2016-17

Addendum C:

**Academic Rank**

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate recommends a review of the policies relating to the awarding of academic rank. Several options are available as described below. If Option #1 is chosen, then no further action is required. If other options are chosen, then the following motion will be made by the Executive Committee:

> *The President of the Academic Senate is directed to work with the administration to revise Board Policy 4245 to reflect the recommended changes to how academic rank is assigned.*

**Option #1**

Keep the current policy on academic rank in place.
- The process has worked fine for years, so there is no need to change it.

**Option #2**

Full-time faculty (including those who are interim or paid through categorical funds) shall be “Associate Professors” for their first four years and then “Professors” afterwards. Part-time faculty shall be “Associate Professors” until they have accumulated a 400% load and then shall be “Professors” afterwards.
- This simplifies the process.
- There is no “academic elitism” for earning a doctorate.
- Part-time faculty are treated the same way as full-time faculty.

**Option #3**

Full-time faculty (including those who are interim or paid through categorical funds) shall be “Associate Professors” for their first four years and then “Professors” afterwards.
Addendum D:

Drop and Census Date Information

Full Term Courses (Fall/Spring)
- Census: Monday of the third week, unless Monday is a holiday then it will be on Tuesday.
- Last Day to Drop with a Refund: Friday before Census, unless Friday is a holiday then it will be Thursday.
- Last Day to Add: Friday before Census, unless Friday is a holiday then it will be Thursday.
- Last Day to Drop Without a "W": Friday following Census, unless Friday is a holiday then it will be Thursday.
- Last Day to Drop: End of the 12th week (75%)

Example for 2017 – 2018 Calendar Year

Fall 2017 Current Dates (if no change)
- Last Day to Drop with a Refund: September 1, 2017 August 30
- Last Day to Add: September 1, 2017 August 30
- Census 1: September 5, 2017 September 11
- Last Day to Drop without a "W": September 8, 2017 September 9
- Last Day to Drop: November 9, 2017 October 24

Spring 2018
- Last Day to Drop with a Refund: February 9, 2018
- Last Day to Add: February 9, 2018
- Census 1: February 12, 2018
- Last Day to Drop without a "W": February 15, 2018
- Last Day to Drop: April 27, 2018

Short Term Courses (including Summer and Intersession)
Short-term courses will have individual dates based on how the course is scheduled.
- Census: Day nearest 20% of the number of days the course is scheduled to meet. IF Census day falls on the first day of the course, Census is on the second day.
- Last Day to Drop with a Refund: Last business day before the Census Date
- Last Day to Add: Last business day before the Census Date
- Last Day to Drop Without a "W": Day nearest 10% of the number of days the course is scheduled to meet. For some courses this will be on the first day of the course.
- Last Day to Drop: Day nearest 75% of the number of days the course is scheduled to meet.