

## COLLEGE OF MARIN ACADEMIC SENATE

### MEETING MINUTES

February 11, 2011

12:45 – 2:00 pm via Zoom Meeting

**Senators Present:** Meg Pasquel, Karen Robinson, Peggy Dodge, Patricia Seery, Jeff Cady, Patricia France, Kristin Perrone, Dave King, Maria Coulson, Kofi Opong-Mensah, Kevin Muller

**Senators Absent:** Shawn Purcell, Paul Cheney, Becky Brown

**Guests:** Rinetta Early, Patrick Kelly, Gina Cullen, Blaze Woodlief, Cari Torres-Benavides, Jonathan Eldridge

#### CALL TO ORDER: 12:45 PM – Zoom Meeting

- I. Approval and Adoption of the Agenda - **ADOPTED (Robinson/Perrone) as amended by all Senators present**
- II. Reading and Approval of the Minutes of December 10, 2020 – **APPROVED (Robinson/Cady) by all Senators present**  
Reading and Approval of the Minutes of January 28, 2021 – **APPROVED (Robinson/Coulson) by all Senators present**  
Reading and Approval of the Minutes of February 4, 2021 – **APPROVED (Muller/Robinson) by all Senators present**
- III. Public Requests to Address the Senate on Non-Agenda Items - **NONE**
- IV. Officers' Reports
  - a) President (Meg Pasquel)- **DEFERRED**
  - b) Vice President (Maria Coulson) - **DEFERRED**
- V. Committee Reports
  - a) Curriculum: Committee Chair Gina Cullen reported on the work completed in Fall 2020 and underway for 2021. The Ad Hoc Degree Articulation And Review Team (DART) has completed review of ADT degrees. A Graphic Design degree and certificate was approved. The Curriculum Committee also worked with Community Education to clearly articulate a process for Community Education courses and Curriculum Committee. Over 400 Course Outlines of Record (COR) were approved for Emergency Distance Education. Technical Review now operates as an Ad Hoc subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee. There continues to be a need for new tech review members and training for all members. The Committee is now turning its attention to CORs needing mandatory revision.
  - b) Academic Standards – **NO REPORT – SEE DISCUSSION ITEM A**
  - c) Other Senate Subcommittee and Governance Committee Reports – **NO REPORTS**
  - d) UPM – **NO REPORT**
- VI. Consent Agenda - **APPROVED (Muller/King) by all Senators present**
  - a) Senator Dodge - Secretary
- VII. Invited Guests: Jonathan Eldridge – LRC Classrooms

VP Eldridge, with participation from AVP Cari Torres Benavides, presented a slide show (attached) that shared data from the 2019-20 Classroom Use Analysis. His report showed that a net of 15 new classrooms would be needed in Kentfield to replace the classrooms lost during bond construction and rid the campus of all portable buildings.

VP Eldridge showed evidence that 10 classrooms and 7 study rooms/offices could be constructed with renovation on the second floor of the Student Services (SS) building. VP Eldridge also reported that the new integrated LRC/SS Project would include 9 new classrooms. If all of the projected classrooms are built, there would be 19 classrooms to replace the 15 that 2019-20 peak use data indicated would be needed. The first floor of SS

could potentially also be renovated to provide 4 more classrooms. VP Eldridge also noted that the IVC Campus had only 15 but now has 23 general use classrooms. VP Eldridge also noted that Bond Spending Plan #13 includes funding for both the Integrated LRC/SS Project and SS Building Classroom construction.

Senate comments/questions and presenter responses included the following:

- The report presented does account for matching the previous supply, but is it sufficient for today's programming? Were evening classroom needs considered in the 2019-20 data?
  - VP Eldridge pointed out that we have more classroom capacity outside of the peak time periods. Student input and the development of a master schedule may help to spread the classroom demand outside of peak periods. The data presented was based on peak time usage and evenings are not considered peak times.
- Based on last week's presentation regarding the integrated LRC/SS project, 3 small, 2 medium, and 1 large classroom as well as a computer classroom and an event space are planned. To get to 9 classrooms in the LRC/SS, we would need to divide the large classroom into two classrooms, and use the event space for 2 large classrooms or 1 classroom.
  - The design we saw was for maximum flexibility. Motorized walls in large classroom and even space will be soundproof. Consideration could also be given to using hard walls to construct two small rather than one large classroom in that space. Event spaces aren't needed all the time so can be considered for classrooms when not in use.
- When getting rid of portables is mentioned, does that include the Village Square portables?
  - Yes.
- Does the bond have sufficient funds for the conversion of the existing SS building to include the 10 classrooms as described? It seems that we would need to keep the portables or be short classrooms after the new LRC/SS is complete and before the SS project is done.
  - We can maintain portables until the SS conversion is complete. The bond spending plan approved by the board scrapes contingency money set aside for projects that have now been completed. Given where things are now, we have enough money to do SS.
- Will the quality of classrooms in the SS building be comparable to what will be built in LRC? Why more classrooms in SS than in the new building when teaching is the heart of what we do at COM? What is the priority for LRC and who made it?
  - The SS classrooms will be new materials. The Pomo Cluster renovation at IVC provides a good example of what can be done in SS. The Pomo classrooms are as nice as any new classrooms. The integrated LRC/SS project has been designed with classrooms but the priority always was on replacing what was in LRC and SS. The location of the cafeteria is still an open question. The district remains steadfast in its intent to have quality classrooms. Priorities are recommended by College Council, a representative body of constituent groups, to the Board.
- The AS wants the right amount of classrooms and has no problem with them in the SS building if the quality is good. Given that priorities have already shifted and we lost a separate new building to replace SS, there are great concerns that the bond money will not be sufficient to complete the SS project. Can you guarantee that the money is set aside?
  - The bond spending plan lays it out. We ended up with one building because the initial survey indicated that was what we wanted. A smaller building with more efficient use of space can still include priority functions from the original LRC and SS.
- College Council as place that makes recommendations to the board is not completely accurate. The bond spending plan specifically was not presented to College Council other than as an item on the board agenda that Dr. Coon presents each meeting. College Council doesn't necessarily see everything and has not been invited to change board agendas. Bond spending plans have been revised several times but no specific

presentation of what the changes are has been done for College Council.

- For a deeper analysis of the bond spending plan, the AS should invite Assistant Superintendent/VP Greg Nelson as that is his area of expertise and responsibility.
- The AS called VP Eldridge's attention to the still unanswered concern expressed on 2/4/2021 by the AS to the LRC/SS designers. The concern centers around why the new building layouts locate the Transfer Center and Career Center in separate areas of the building.

#### VIII. Action Items - **NONE**

#### IX. Discussion

- a) AP 4231: Grade Change – Academic Standards Committee Chair Rinetta Early shared the latest version of AP4231 and noted that the procedure did not change but was clarified. Proposed clarifications have been reviewed and endorsed by UPM and COM College Counsel Mia Robertshaw. UPM President Patrick Kelly agreed that the version being considered at this time has the approval of UPM. A Senator noted the inconsistent use of "incompetence" and "incompetency" within the AP. UPM President Kelly agreed to check the Education Code for proper wording and make the changes to submit to the AS. **Motion to Approve AP4231 with changes (Dodge/Perrone) moves this item to Action for 2/18/2021.**
- b) New Senators: President Pasquel reported that Senator Paul Cheney is not available to attend Senate meetings this semester and that his spot is up for election this Spring. President Pasquel recommended and Senators present agreed that we would leave that spot open until the election this Spring. President Pasquel also reported that Senator Becky Brown has a schedule conflict and cannot attend AS meetings this semester. Following our newly adopted policy, Senator Brown put forth 6 potential candidates from her department to replace her. President Pasquel contacted all 6 recommended individuals and none were able to commit to the Academic Senate for this semester. President Pasquel consulted Senators regarding looking for a replacement for Senator Brown outside of her own department. Senators agreed that due diligence had been done by Senator Brown and President Pasquel to find a replacement from a Science discipline. Senator Maria Coulson, who does teach in a STEM discipline, offered to reach out again before we move on to recruiting a replacement from an unaffiliated discipline. Senators discussed the pros and cons of structuring the AS in such a way that seats are representatives of programs/departments. The size of COM and the configuration of our departments seems not to lend itself to specifically representative seats. It is equally important to have Senators willing to take a broad view of the college as it is to have discipline/department representation.
- c) DE and Hybrid courses – **DEFERRED**
- d) Community Hour - **DEFERRED**

#### X. Future Business

- Pathways plan with Cari Torres Benavides/Gina Cullen
- Invite Greg Nelson on 2/27
- Retiree Gifts

#### XI. Adjournment: 2:00 pm

For questions or information concerning the Academic Senate Minutes, please contact: Peggy Dodge, Acting AS Secretary: [pdodge@marin.edu](mailto:pdodge@marin.edu)