



Minutes of the  
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
March 4, 2013

APPROVED

- PRESENT:** Richard Albistegui-Dubois, Glyn Bongolan, Melinda Carrillo, Haydn Davis, Ken Dodson, Barb Kelber, Greg Larson, Teresa Laughlin, Jackie Martin, Pam McDonough, Linda Morrow, Patrick O'Brien, Lillian Payn, Susan Snow, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka
- ABSENT:** Christina Moore, Fari Towfiq
- GUESTS:** Berta Cuaron, P.J. DeMaris, Shannon Lienhart, Wendy Nelson, Elvia Nunez, Wilma Owens, Mark Vernoy
- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by the President, Greg Larson, at 2:00 p.m., in Room SU-30.
- Approval of Minutes:**
- Motion 1** MSC Morrow, Laughlin: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of February 25, 2013, as amended. The motion carried.
- Public Comments:** There were no public comments.
- Announcements:** There were no announcements.
- Welcome:** New Senators Richard Albistegui-Dubois, Glyn Bongolan, and Susan Snow were welcomed.
- Committee Appointments:**
- Motion 2** MSC O'Brien, Davis: Faculty Senate approval of the following committee appointment:  
Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee  
(11-13)  
Abbie Cory, English  
  
The motion carried.
- Elections:** Patrick O'Brien announced that a call to fill Faculty Senate vacancies for the fall semester would be distributed this week.
- Curriculum:** Copies of the Curriculum Consent Calendar dated February 20, 2013, were provided electronically last week.
- Motion 3** MSC Morrow, Kelber: Faculty Senate ratification of the Curriculum items dated February 20, 2013. The motion carried.

PFF Resolution  
Opposing Privatization  
Of Education:

At last week's meeting, Shannon Lienhart shared a Resolution supported by the Palomar Faculty Federation (PFF) that opposes the privatization of public education and in particular seeks to ensure that before Palomar enters into educational contracts with private firms that these contracts be vetted by the Faculty Senate and the PFF. The resolution also asks that there be discipline-appropriate approval of proposed workshops and other activities by for-profit educational entities that may result in the recruitment of students.

The Resolution passed by the PFF includes wording, "that all new or continuing educational contracts with private firms be given serious consideration by the Faculty Senate and the Palomar Faculty Federation before any such contracts are sent for approval to the Board of Trustees," and "that the Palomar Faculty Federation advocates that the scheduling of workshops or any venue which may result in recruitment of students by for-profit educational entities be pre-approved by the related disciplines." Some Senators and guests spoke to that portion of the resolution, expressing concern with the implications for various workshops and the potential implications to faculty, particularly Counseling faculty. It was noted that the resolutions might be worded to more clearly address the problems they are designed to address, such as the offering of courses that are developed through companies and then packaged and sold to colleges to offer for credit. It was noted, however, that such courses would have to be approved through Palomar's Curriculum process before they could be offered here.

It was also noted that there are campus-wide notifications sent out each week on scheduled workshops via the Transfer Center and Career Center Newsletters, Professional Development, and the Two Minutes of News, providing information campus-wide.

This item will be brought back for further discussion and/or Action at next week's meeting.

Accreditation Team  
Members Observing  
Online Teaching:

At last week's meeting, Greg Larson reported on information currently being shared by two institutions that Accreditation team members have enrolled (as faculty) in online classes for monitoring purposes, and Senate members discussed what appears to be a widespread fear by all districts of being sanctioned or placed on warning.

Motion 4

MSCU Laughlin, Morrow: WHEREAS Palomar College supports Academic Freedom in both board policy and the Palomar Faculty Federation/District Agreement, and

WHEREAS Palomar College faculty are legally obligated to follow the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines,

BE IT RESOLVED that any observations of a course be it face-to-face or online outside of contractual evaluations must have the expressed permission of the faculty member.

The motion carried unanimously.

Barb Kelber shared the current process in place regarding access for an online observation, in which the evaluatee submits a request to provide the faculty evaluator with

student access for a specific period of time. The evaluatee gives notice to online students that another faculty member will view the discussion board and/or online class participation during the agreed time frame, if the evaluatee believes it is appropriate.

Lillian Payn shared that members of Academic Technology recommended establishing a procedure that will ask instructors if they wish to “opt in” to participate, meaning that they would be giving permission for accreditation visitors to view their classes for a specified period of time. There is also an option in Blackboard that the ATRC Staff can set that would allow limited observation with selected levels of access through Blackboard. This needs to be approved by the Instruction Office, which has designated only two levels of access to date: instructor and student. The Faculty Senate would need to recommend another level of access to the Instruction Office.

Accreditation:

Greg Larson reported that the Accreditation Report is due March 31, 2013. He indicated that there is a big focus on Student Learning Outcomes and GE Outcomes.

Wendy Nelson reported that Palomar will be completing the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) 2013 Annual Report. Data will be used from Fall 2012 and the two previous fall semesters to complete the report except where specified otherwise.

Nelson informed Senators that two new pieces of information are being asked for in this report:

Percent of all college programs with SLO assessment results available to prospective students  
URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for programs.

She stated that Berta Cuaron and Michelle Barton are attempting to obtain more information from ACCJC, and this will likely be a Faculty Senate issue on how and whether to move forward with this request since faculty long ago were assured that assessment results would not be public information. One option Palomar is considering is to include a link to Palomar’s Program Review and Planning (PRP) documents, which Nelson stated are public documents and listed on Palomar’s website under “Research and Planning.” One area of the PRP document asks for documentation of a program SLO and assessment results. It was discussed whether there is pressure from the Department of Education to provide this information, but it was noted that it is important for there to be discussion on campus about this important issue. Nelson noted at this time Palomar faculty members have focused on course outcomes and are just beginning their work on program outcomes.

Nelson also reported that the report included the addition of several questions relating to General Education Programs, including the need to define outcomes from those programs and to distinguish whether or not these outcomes are different from Institutional Learning Outcomes.

Members of the Learning Outcomes Council will go over some of these questions at their meeting later this week.

This item will remain on the agenda for further discussion next week.

CCCECE Senate  
Information:

Diane Studinka shared the following letter from Joel Gordon of the California Community College Early Childhood Educators (CCCECE):

February 20, 2013

**Sent on Behalf of Joel Gordon, CCCECE President:**

Will the State Academic Senate forbid ECE/Child Development Faculty from Preparing Teachers? Talk to your Academic Senate NOW!

Colleagues,

This April the State Academic Senate will vote to create (or not) a new discipline: Teacher Education. The minimum qualifications to teach in this discipline were designed to specifically exclude a Master's Degree in Child Development or Early Childhood Education. It is unclear as to why those who are championing this new degree feel that we are not qualified to teach education. However, at this point it is critical that your department LET YOUR ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT KNOW THAT THEY NEED TO OPPOSE THE RESOLUTION TO CREATE THIS DISCIPLINE, UNLESS CHILD DEVELOPMENT/ECE FACULTY ARE INCLUDED. Here are some facts you need to know in order to make your presentation to your local senate:

1. The current proposal, by excluding a Master's in ECE or Child Development, degrades the discipline of ECE since even with a valid teaching credential, individuals would not meet the minimum qualifications, but someone with a Master's in Physics, Psych, or History would.
2. ECE is a discipline that specifically addresses learning and teaching, while many others included in the list do not.
3. Possession of content knowledge required for teacher preparation is not dependent on possession of a K-12 teaching credential. By requiring that individuals hold a K-12 teaching credential (OR the equivalent) in addition to the Master's Degree, this proposal generates confusion between the Master's and the Non-Master's Disciplines Lists. (Disciplines that have an experience requirement are on the Non-Master's List.) However, a Master's Degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development does include strong preparation in pedagogy and child development from infancy through adolescence, with study related to each of the academic domains addressed in prekindergarten through 12th grade.
4. Disciplines are usually written to be more inclusive not exclusive when options are given. The term P-12 (Preschool) is replacing K-12 throughout California schools. Our Disciplines List must respond to the workplace of the future. A Master's Degree in ECE or Child Development must be included in the minimum qualifications in order to make this new discipline relevant.

FYI, there is currently an education discipline that does allow child development faculty to be instructors. While this discipline would not be eliminated it is anticipated that the new discipline would ultimately supersede the old discipline in the TMC model.

For your reference you can find out the details of the Disciplines List revision process at <http://www.asccc.org/disciplines-list>

Joel Gordon, President

Studinka stated that members of the Child Development are opposed to this proposal, and asked that this item be brought back next week for Faculty Senate Action as Greg Larson will be attending the Statewide Academic Senate Spring Session next month.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pam McDonough, Secretary