

Standards and Practices Committee

Friday December 19th, 2014

10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

ASCCC Office – One Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA

**Members Present:** J. Adams, P. Crawford, A. Foster, C. Rutan, P. Setziol

**Members Absent:** A. Juarez, J. Bruno

Meeting called to order at 9:58 AM

1. Order of the Agenda: Agenda approved as presented.
2. Approval of the Minutes from 10/4/14: Minutes approved as presented (P. Setziol/A. Foster)
3. Disciplines List Summary from Fall Plenary Hearing

The disciplines list summary was updated to include the wording changes for the Counseling, DSPS position, add the testimony received during the hearing at fall session, and to remove the pulled DSPS Director position. A. Foster asked about the Director proposal and what will happen with it. C. Rutan reported that it isn’t clear whether CAPED will attempt to change Title 5 without bringing the revision through the ASCCC process. C. Rutan will update the committee as more information becomes available. The four remaining proposals will be brought to the February Executive Committee meeting in San Jose.

1. Discussion of Possible Changes to Letter/Application for Exemplary Program Award:

During the recent review of applications for the Exemplary Program Award, there were two anomalies in the process. One college exceeded the 200-word limit for each section of the application. The college may not have realized that the additional information boxes do not give an additional 200 words and anything written in those boxes counts toward the 200 word limit for that section. The committee agreed the additional information boxes should be removed from all of the award applications to avoid confusion in the future. An additional anomaly was that one college’s application included a five-page letter that detailed many of the reasons that the program is exemplary. Since there are no criteria for the letter, the college president submitted an appropriate letter, but the letter was very different from all of the other letters submitted. The committee agreed that the letter should be up to three pages long, single spaced, with 12 point font. The committee felt that these guidelines will encourage colleges to use the letter to include additional details that do not fit within the 200 word limits for each section. The norming call for the Hayward Award is scheduled for January 6th, 2015. C. Rutan will contact James Todd, Chair of the ASCCC Equity and Diversity Action Committee, to coordinate the reading of the applications for the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award.

1. Strategies to Increase the Number of Award Applications

With only seven submitted applications for the Exemplary Program Award, there was concern that many programs are not being recognized. A. Foster indicated that this fall was particularly difficult because of the SSSP and Equity plan submission timelines. It was suggested that all award announcements should be sent out to the CEO/CIO/CSSO listservs. A. Foster suggested having the Area Representatives sending out follow up emails after the initial notification comes out for the ASCCC Office. J. Adams suggested that there could be a competition between the areas to see which area has the most colleges that apply. P. Crawford suggested that we need a listserv for all local senators, not just the senate presidents. It was also suggested that the theme of the Exemplary Program Award should be determined prior to the spring plenary session, so that the award can be advertised to the entire faculty present. P. Setziol indicated that local senates may only discuss the awards they intend to submit an application for. It was suggested that each senate could designate a senator to monitor awards and encourage their senates to apply. S&P will discuss bringing a resolution forward to spring session about this.

1. Complete Bylaws Revision

The primary feedback from the plenary session breakout was the need to detailed explanation for each proposed change. C. Rutan added additional rational to each section and the proposed revisions have been sent to the Senate’s attorney to ensure they are compliant with legal requirements. AB2755, effective January 1, 2015, requires all members of a nonprofit board to have voting rights. Resolution 1.01 F2009 established the position that the Executive Director is an officer of ASCCC and that the rules should be revised to reflect that. The new legislation grants voting rights to the Executive Director and the bylaws revision reflects that change. P. Crawford indicated that the delegates may prefer that only elected faculty members vote and encouraged a change to the revision to state that the Executive Director is not a member of the Executive Committee. C. Rutan indicated that the Executive Committee will be asked to recommend how to proceed, but the adopted resolution would be overturned if the Executive Director is no longer a member of the Executive Committee. The bylaws also change the term of Executive Committee Members so that they begin on June 1 instead of July 1. The committee section has also been revised to reflect current practice of the Executive Committee approving all appointments to standing committees and the president making all other faculty appointments. P. Crawford would prefer to keep the current language that requires the Executive Committee to approve all faculty appointments and committee chairs. C. Rutan will seek the input of the Executive Committee on this issue.

1. Senate Rules

Two primary changes to the Senate Rules are being proposed. The first is to remove the responsibilities of the officers and move that information into the bylaws. These general responsibilities should not be changed, so it was agreed that they make more sense for the bylaws. The committee section has been revamped to provide the Executive Committee with increased flexibility to determine how best to address the needs and positions of the organization. The number of listed standing committees will be reduced, but the Executive Committee can maintain existing committees or create new ones as needed.

1. Norbert Bischof Faculty Freedom Fighter Award

Standards and Practices received a nomination for the NBFFF Award, but they had questions about whether there is a call for nominations or whether there are any criteria to evaluate the nominations. C. Rutan will bring this item to the January Executive Committee meeting for additional guidance and the item will be brought back to the January 17, 2015 meeting of Standards and Practices.

1. Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

C. Rutan presented an overview of the Periodic Review of the Academic Senate that was adopted at the spring 2014 plenary session. There will be 10 reviewers selected during a general session at the spring 2015 plenary session from registered delegates, faculty appointees, and plenary session/institute attendees. The committee members were asked to review the adopted documents and determine what S&P needs to do to facilitate the review process that will begin after the spring plenary session.

1. Other

P. Setziol brought forward a collection of possible survey questions that could be used to update the equivalency paper. The questions will be brought as an agenda item to the January 17, 2015 Standards and Practices meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Craig Rutan

Approved January 17, 2015