

Ohlone College Faculty Senate
Minutes
March 1, 2017
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Rm. 7101

Members Present: Larissa Favela, Lisa Wesoloski, Drew Wise, Barbara Duggal, Narinder Bansal, Sobia Saleem, Jim McManus, Nan Zhou, Roberto Santiago, Debbie Franklin, Rose Margaret Itua

Members Absent: Brenda Ahnholz, Jacqlyn Vetter, Sheryl Einfalt, Mark Grabiner

Others Present: Rob Smedfjeld, Leta Stagnaro, Janel Tomlin-Brown, Diane Berkland, Marty Kludjian, Miguel Fuentes

1. Share - All (I)
 - a. Favorite Oscar nominated movies were shared.
2. Approval of Minutes from Feb. 15, 2017 – J. McManus (A)
 - a. Minutes approved pending minor revisions. Barbara moved, Drew seconded.
3. Academic Appeals - D. Berkland and J. Tomblin-Brown (A)
 - a. Additional discussion from the last meeting: definitions added for Fraud, Bad Faith and Incompetency to Revised Grade Appeal form, Minimum board numbers from other colleges were presented to compare with the number/composition options with the current recommendation of 2 faculty, 1 admin/mgr, 1 student with admin/mgr with voting rights still in question.
 - i. Leta stated a non-faculty member deciding about grades is in a gray area, but for conduct it would be okay
 - ii. Rob clarified we were talking only about a conduct board and he thinks every member should vote and for academic cases only faculty should vote, but for the 4 different academic appeal areas maybe it should depend on which area.
 - iii. Marty stated that student representation on a panel is important since appealing students could potentially have more at risk than just a single grade, and would fairly benefit by having a peer who understands that as part of the hearing committee.
 - iv. Leta summarized the current system: Step 1: student talks to faculty member with whom they have issue, and if not satisfied with the outcome...Step 2: Student talks with the dean overseeing that faculty

member, and if not satisfied with the decision of the dean...Step 3: student presents case to appeals committee, and it's up to the student to convince the committee that the grade they received was improper, after which...Step 4: Leta is the "Supreme Court" and considers the results of all 3 previous steps while deciding the College's decision

- v. Conduct committee defined: Diane (chair) 4 Faculty, 1 adm/mgr, 2 students
- b. We are voting to remove Step 4 from this process. This AP 4231 change aligns us with the Ed Code (AP changed under perview of the President)
 - i. A faculty member asked Leta if she had ever rejected a decision made by the hearing committee. Leta said she had never done so.
 - ii. Janel said only one time had there been an override which was due to a large number of grey areas involved in the case.
 - iii. Motion to endorse changes to AP 4231 passed unanimously (Debbie moved, Larissa seconded)
 - iv. Motion to endorse the revised academic appeals form passed unanimously (Roberto moved, Barbara Dugal seconded)
 - v. Motion considered to endorse Student Conduct Committee Board composition changes to 1 chair, 5 faculty, 1 admin/mgr, 2 students, with a hearing committee minimum of 1 chair, 1 faculty, 1 admin/mgr , 1 student (AP 5520 currently says board should be 2 admin/mgr, 2 faculty, 2 students) (Rob/Martin recommending limiting the number of voting members regardless of how many board members are present at a hearing) (Rose Margaret added that the chair should choose a fair hearing committee considering factors like diversity). TABLED.
- 4. Update on College Council Committees - R. Smedfjeld (I)
 - a. Rob advised that college council has been working on a document regarding committees, his concern is that there should be language in the document supporting the need for faculty input on committees that make decisions that coincide with any topics from 10 +1, regardless on whether the committee sits under faculty senate or college council. Examples are college counsel subcommittees Basic Skills and International Education. Faculty should take an active role in their committee work to support the faculty at large (echoed by Lita).
 - b. Sobia is a member of the international education committee and said she has sometimes been unsure if certain topics fall under the perview of the faculty/ 10 +1 or are administrative in nature. Rob stated that faculty should contact the faculty senate president with those kind of questions.

5. Update on New Programs - L. Favela (I)

- a. Larissa: Preliminary meeting took place and data has been provided. Ideas were discussed and more meetings are planned.
- b. Leta: Focused response to workforce needs in the Bay Area.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.